

PER'S MANIFESTO

An Electronic Newsletter of News and Opinion on Gender Issues

1996-1998

*“Tired of man-bashing and anti-male stereotypes?
Read Per's MANifesto, a monthly newsletter on anti-
male attitudes and related topics. An informative
package of news and humor.”*

*“MANifesto is a monthly newsletter containing news
and opinion for people interested in gender equality
and gender stereotypes. If you would like to have
MANifesto e-mailed to you, send the message 'sub-
scribe MANifesto' to psmaowens@gnn.com”*

CONTENTS

1996	1
1997	77
1998	153
Notes	219

1996

JANUARY 1996

The Veggie-Penis Lawsuit

Newsgroups: alt.feminism,soc.men

Date: Thu, 28 Dec 1995 13:32:25

A woman is suing a nursing home in Peterborough, New Hampshire over a prank on the day before April Fool's Day. Irene Palmer's co-workers at Pheasant Wood Nursing Home got a police officer to pretend to arrest her. She was handcuffed and taken outside, then was told it was a joke.

She wants money. She says the nursing home should pay her \$1.8 million.

Apparently she thinks she could put \$1.8 million dollars to better use than a nursing home.

She also filed an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claiming sexual harassment because someone at the nursing home put up a photograph showing Palmer holding a vegetable that resembles a penis.

In her lawsuit, Palmer say the incidents caused her to lose sleep and gain weight and made her nervous and depressed and unable to concentrate.

If conditions are too rough for this woman in a nursing home, perhaps she should switch careers -- to the military, for example. Feminists keep telling us that this is the gender that can stand up to the horrors of combat.¹

Jesus Christ: Potential Rapist

In a thread called "Feminist Logic," I posted the following, sure that most people would understand the absurdity:

- All men are potential rapists
- Jesus Christ was a man
- Therefore, Jesus Christ was a potential rapist.

But In article* ... Hanah Chapman,[†] ... wrote:

"Yep. If Jesus Christ had a penis, he was capable of rape."

(Feminists used to be upset if anyone suggested that their abilities and flaws were predetermined by their bodies. But now being male automatically makes you capable of rape.)²

Chief Wins Harassment Suit

Newsgroups: soc.men

Date: Fri, 29 Dec 1995 11:49:46

San Francisco's police chief has won a federal sexual harassment case in which the charges had an awful lot of political overtones. Joanne Welsh accused Police Chief Anthony Ribera of kissing her, making suggestive remarks, and giving her unwanted earrings. Here's the latest advance in feminism: getting compensation for receiving unwanted earrings.

But what this woman *really* wanted was nearly two million bucks.

However there was something fishy about her story from the start. Welsh has a boyfriend who had been the city Supervisor. Chief Ribera and the boyfriend had a big blowup in the office one day. The very next day, Welsh is filing her charges.

She said the timing was coincidence.

Right.

But there were other suspicious factors as well.

Chief Ribera was an ally of Mayor Frank Jordan. But Jordan lost his bid for reelection, and then opponents went after his ally, Ribera.

Yes, it smells of politics. But remember, feminists tell us that women never lie about these things.

After she lost, Welsh said "I think that women can pretty much emphasize with me on how difficult it is to prove to someone what happens behind closed doors."

Yes, it is pretty difficult to prove what happens behind closed doors. But that goes both ways. It's difficult to prove your innocent if there is absolutely no evidence to refute except her word.

I can certainly empathize with a man who is hauled into court and has to pay expensive legal fees to fight an unsupported and unprovable accusation about "what happens behind closed doors."

* See: <4eg0jcspvh@ra.isisnet.com>

† See: <ae964@ccn.cs.dal.ca> (Hanah Chapman)

The question is: when you have one person's word against another's and the charges cannot be proven or verified, why do we still haul men into court and make them go through this expensive ordeal? Just because a woman says so?³

Sexual Harassment at the Corp. For Public Broadcasting

A member of the board for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is being accused of harassing an employee of the corporation. (This is really a scandal because CPB distributes federal money for the ultra-politically correct National Public Radio and PBS. So here is a member of the ultra-PC group accused of sexual harassment.)

Among the charges: that the board member sent the employee a red nightshirt that said "I Only Sleep With the Best!" and checked into the employee's marital status and made repeated unwelcome advances during a party, repeatedly made unwelcome invitations to dinner or drinks, and later kissed the employee on the mouth. When these advances were rebuffed, the board member retaliated by trying to get the employee fired.

Shades of Bob Packwood! In fact, you might remember that during the Packwood hearings, women's advocates took out big ads asking, "If your boss stuck his tongue in your mouth, would he still have a job?"

But this CPB board member still has her job. Her name is Martha Buchanan. The man she is accused of harassing is Fred DeMarco. DeMarco said he found the woman "physically repulsive" as she tried to force her attention on him. When he turned her down, he found out that she was denigrating his work and telling other people that he should be fired.

Nonetheless, DeMarco is taking it "like a man." He isn't filing a lawsuit, even though lawyers for the CPB say he has one heck of a case. No victimhood jackpot and lucrative book tour for this man. No cover of Time and People. He just wanted to be able to do his job.

The Washington Post reports on the case in its December 12th edition. The Post observes: "This is a story about a Washington in which fear of being sued can turn a bureaucracy inside out. It is about a world in

which decisions are driven by fear of public exposure, embarrassment, political repercussions." It's nice of the Post to finally realize that sexual harassment charges involve an awful lot of politics. It just took a case in which a woman is accused for the Post to make that connection.

As for the National Public Radio, this whole episode is rather ironic, because NPR broke the Anita Hill story. Now the organization that holds the purse strings for NPR has on its board a female harasser who got off scot free. You have to wonder how it will affect NPR's "crusading" coverage. Of course, NPR was never all that hot for digging into how issues like this affect men in the first place. Now they might be even less inclined to do so.⁴

Feminist Pay Grab Defeated

It is heartening to see that a judge recently overturned a pay-grab scheme by women who work in school cafeterias in the Everett, Mass., school district.

Fifty-five women filed suit claiming that they deserved to be paid as much as the male custodians who work for the schools. They said it was discrimination that they weren't paid as much.

Now if those women had applied for jobs as custodians and been turned down, I'd say they have a good case. But they didn't. They wanted to continue working in the cafeteria while getting paid as much as the men who are custodians. They claimed it was a case of "equal pay for equal work." But they weren't willing to do equal work for equal pay.

The school district argued that the work was not equal. Their lawyer said, "Serving pizza -- is that comparable substantially to pushing a broom? I would argue, no, they don't bear any resemblance." I think he has a dam good point. Maybe the cafeteria workers have to clean dirty dishes, but the custodians have to clean dirty toilets and urinals. And maybe the cafeteria workers have to clean up spilled spaghetti now and then, but the custodians have to clean up vomit, etc., now and then. In fact, if there is an especially nasty mess in the kitchen, I bet those women call the custodians to clean it up. These women just wanted to stay in a less disgusting job while getting the same pay. If

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

the work is just the same and they want the extra pay, why don't they apply for custodial work?

The sad part is that these women actually got a lower court to award them a million dollars. But that pay-grab was overturned this week on appeal. That's a victory for common sense.⁵

Northern Exposure Actor Charged

Actor Robert Nicholson, who plays the cook Sonny on "Northern Exposure," was just charged with misdemeanor assault on a woman. Does he deserve it? Here's the deal. Police said they got conflicting accounts from Nicholson and the woman. She claimed that he hit her after she ridiculed him and called him names. He says she threw a drink on him and then came at him and broke his glasses and he shoved her away and she hit her nose.

So whose at fault? It's impossible to say. There are no other witnesses besides the two involved. But police charged him. She has not been charged.

In fact, police aren't even releasing her name. So he gets charged and has his name printed, while she is not charged, and her identity is "protected."

For some reason, they call this the "justice" system.⁶

Male and Presumed Guilty

Here are three sad and disturbing cases in which being male equals being guilty.

First, there's the case of Cmdr. Robert Stumpf, a Navy "top gun" fighter pilot, whose career is being ruined by the type of tactics familiar to those who study McCarthyism.

Cmdr. Stumpf was at the infamous "Tailhook" convention in 1991. In the wake of all the political pressure that followed, Stumpf and 132 other men were put on a secret list documenting rumors or unproven accusations of misconduct at Tailhook. The accusations against Stumpf boil down to his presence in a room where a stripper performed. He was cleared of all other charges. But his promotion has been derailed and his career ruined simply because his name was on that list.

The reason: The Senate Armed Services Committee requires that the Navy flag the

dossiers of all of those 133 men who were accused by unseen accusers. This special flagging is known as "Tailhook certification." It applies even to the men, like Stumpf, who were cleared of any wrongdoing.

But when they come up for promotion, the Senate committee notes that they have "Tailhook certification" and automatically rejects their promotion. This is what happened to Stumpf. The Senate had actually approved his promotion, but then the committee belatedly realized it had overlooked his Tailhook certification. It then applied pressure on the Navy Secretary and got Stumpf's promotion withdrawn. Students of McCarthyism will recognize the secret blacklists, the tactic of guilt by association, and the reliance on unfounded accusations.

There are a couple of ironies about this case. First, feminists insist that all men benefit because "men hold most of the power." Well, here's the predominantly male Senate caving in to political pressure and selling out an innocent man.

According to the Washington Post, (Jan. 7) Stumpf was a former leader of the Blue Angels flying team and was in training to command the eight squadrons of planes on the USS Enterprise bound for duty in Bosnia. Instead, the Post says he is now doing "make work" at the Naval Air Station in Virginia Beach.

Stumpf's case is an ironic contrast to that of Kara Hultgreen, who became a fighter pilot amid a lot of political pressure to put women in military planes. Hultgreen crashed and died while attempting to land on an aircraft carrier. The brass tried to blame mechanical problems, but confidential reports leaked to the Internet and the news media showed that the cause was pilot error. So the political pressures that put her in the cockpit are also keeping a qualified male out.

Case two of "Male and Presumed Guilty" involves computer consultant Louis Chatroop of Des Plaines, Illinois. Chatroop dated a woman for a few months and loaned her \$3,800. When they broke up, he asked for repayment on the loan. When she refused, he filed a lawsuit.

Next thing he knows, the woman has accused him of stalking. And because of the new anti-stalking law, he was thrown into prison and held without bail. This was done based solely on the woman's accusation -- and even though she has changed and embellished her story several times.

Chatroop has no criminal record. His ex-wife and another girlfriend have told authorities that he is not violent or obsessive, and that other girlfriend testified to his whereabouts during the time of the supposed stalking. Doesn't matter. There is not one bit of evidence to support the accuser's claim, and several inconsistencies in her accusation, but Chatroop is held without bond.

Chatroop is self-employed, and being incarcerated has ruined his business. Chicago Tribune columnist Eric Zorn notes (Oct. 5, 1995): "Chatroop ... said he has no clients left and almost no money. To try to avoid bankruptcy as his lawyers prepare for a still unscheduled trial, he has drained his retirement funds and stopped paying child support for his three sons."

The concept of "women and children first" has carried over into our justice system. The lives of men are now expendable for the sake of protecting women -- even if there might not be any danger to protect them from. We can't risk any harm befalling a woman, and so we must toss out 800 years of common law and the presumption of innocent when a man is accused.

And here's a horror story from the front lines of the War on Rape, as detailed on the front page of the Dec. 20 Washington Post.

Christopher Prince is in a Virginia prison. The police say he is innocent. The prosecutor wants him freed. The two girls who accused him now say he is innocent. But Prince, 19, can't get out of prison.

It started Feb. 9, 1994, when a 13-year-old girl and her 12-year old friend claimed that two men had broken into the older girl's home and demanded to have sex with them. They claimed that they somehow escaped untouched and notified neighbors. They picked Prince out of a police lineup.

With no physical evidence, it was a case of their word against his. But Prince, who has an IQ of 75, was told by his lawyer to

plead guilty to avoid a harsher sentence if convicted. He did and was sentenced to 12 years, with six suspended, and has been in prison for 15 months.

But his family hired a private detective to check the girl's stories. The stories changed and then unraveled. Both girls now have sign affidavits admitting that they lied. Polygraph tests indicate that this time they are telling the truth. Even the mother of the younger girl says of their story, "It never felt right to me, but no one seemed interested in what I thought."

A judge recently reviewed the case and said Prince should be freed, but he didn't have the authority to do it. Prince's best hope is for early release is to get the governor to grant clemency, which he has requested.

(Editor's note: After the Washington Post ran a front-page article on Prince, the governor of Virginia signed the papers and freed the innocent man. Prince got home in time for Christmas.)⁷

FEBRUARY 1996

It Takes A Pillage

Maybe you don't want to buy Hillary Rodham Clinton's new book. But you're paying for it anyway.

On her book tour to promote "It Takes A Village," Hillary is flying on Air Force planes that cost more than \$2,600 an *hour* to operate. And she's going to twelve cities.

HRC (Her Royal Clintonness) will reimburse taxpayers for what a regular air ticket would cost. That will cover only a small fraction of the cost of carting her around. You, the taxpayer will pick up the rest.

Hope you enjoy the book.⁸

Killed by a False Rape Charge

Eddie Polec was 16. He was an altar boy at Philadelphia's St. Cecilia's Catholic Church. He was beaten to death on the steps of that church in November 1994 because someone made a false rape accusation against him.

Polec was attacked by several teen boys enraged when they were told Polec had raped one of their friends. As they beat Polec to death, several girls stood around laughing, the Associated Press reported.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Four teen boys were convicted in February 1996 of the attack. However, no charges have ever been filed against the girl who made the fatal accusation. "Incitement to riot" charges might have been appropriate -- if the incident had been fomented by a male. However, in the current climate of rape hysteria, even false accusations that result in death go unpunished.

Feminists ask, "Why would she lie?"

Answer: Because she gets away with murder.⁹

Separate and Unequal Justice

Here's another example of separate and unequal justice. In this case a man and woman both abandoned their unruly son in Cape May, New Jersey, and moved to California. Authorities tracked them down and charged them with abandonment. One parent got nine months in jail. The other got six months. Guess who got the longer sentence.

Now how did you know it was the man? You've heard this story before, right?

But here are some other interesting facts about the case. After a history of disruptive behavior, the boy had become enraged to learn that the father was not his biological father. The boy, six-feet tall and more than 200 pounds, then threatened to blow his father's head off with a gun.

Now picture this situation turned around. Suppose the boy wasn't the woman's real son, and suppose he threatened to kill her. If that was the case, I doubt she would have gotten any sentence at all. (Heck, she might have been able to shoot him and claim a battered woman defense.) Certainly she wouldn't have gotten a *longer* sentence than her husband for committing the same offense.

Moral of the story: Men's responsibilities are greater. Women who fail at the same responsibilities or commit the same offenses don't merit the same punishment.¹⁰

Junior Discrimination

Clark Clementsen of San Francisco has done hours of charitable work, including giving free makeovers to battered women and helping abused children. He would like to join a charitable organization in his area to continue his activism. But the group won't even mail him an application form.

The group is the Junior League, and it's a women's group. Their attitude: there are other groups he can join: why does he have to join our group? "Women need an organization where they can develop leadership skills," says one of the pro-discrimination member of the San Jose chapter.

(If that's so, then perhaps the Junior League also believes young men need all-male military academies where they can develop leadership skills.*)¹¹

The Governor of Illinois is Male

You hear feminists talk about how women are disadvantage because men hold a disproportionate amount of power. You hear them rattle off the statistics: men make up blah-blah percent of the corporate boards, hold yada-yada percent of public office, etc. The insinuation is that because a man holds the office, it must be to the disadvantage of women (or at least feminists).

But consider the governor of Illinois, Jim Edgar. He's a white male Republican. Must be a patriarchal oppressor, right?

In a way, yes. He is very patriarchal in his outlook, in that he believes that children belong with women and that women's lives must be protected.

While in office, Edgar has received requests for clemency from six men on death row. He has turned down every one. But Edgar recently gave clemency to a woman on death row. The woman had not even asked for it.

In explaining his decision, he said gender was not a factor. But he said that in this sort of decision, he'd have to look himself in the mirror in the morning. Apparently that would be very hard for him if he sent a woman to her death. No mirror problems when he sends a man to his death, though.

One of the men he sent to death had a record remarkably similar to that of the woman he spared. Both had killed two people. They both killed a child, went to prison for it, got out and killed again. In fact, the woman killed within four months of getting out.

But the man got execution, the woman got victimhood status and a reprieve. The man

* (Source: *USA Today*, February 19, 1996, page 2A.)

had been severely abused by his stepmother while a child. It didn't gain him clemency.

Consider also that Gov. Edgar is extremely anti-father. He has sided against the real father in every disputed custody case that has occurred in Illinois. Most notably in one famous case, Gov. Edgar was outraged that the father of Baby Richard got custody of his own child!

Contrary to feminist rhetoric, having a man in a position of power is not always to the advantage of men.¹²

Women's Studies: Your Money at Work

Tim Egan, a reporter for The New York Times in Seattle, reported in 1988 about a business major named Pete Schaub at the University of Washington who enrolled in a course called "Introduction to Women's Studies" taught by Donna Langston and Dana-Michele Brown. On the first day of class, he and the class were told that traditional American families are dysfunctional. Students who said *their* families were quite functional were shouted down by the teaching assistants with cries, in unison, of "Denial! Denial!" A few days later, Prof. Langston brought guest speakers in to talk about masturbation. "They said you don't need a man," Schaub told Egan. "They proceeded to show how to masturbate with a feather duster, and they had dildos right there." When Prof. Brown said statistics showed lesbians could raise children better than married couples, Schaub went up after class and quietly asked for her source. Prof. Brown dismissed him and his question. "Why are you challenging me?" she said. "Get away from me. Just leave me alone." A member of the class called Schaub "a chauvinist goddamn bastard." The next day, his professor had two campus police officers there to enforce her order banning Schaub from her class. Schaub protested the ban. Weeks later, the administration said he could go back to class. But Associate Dean James Nason advised him to drop the course.

I haven't seen open public criticism of this trend outside academe.

Gays and lesbians have pre-empted criticism from outside academe (principally from the media, including the world of book publishing) because they've been able to

define any opposition as a disease called "homophobia."^{*}

-- From "Homosexuality, A Freedom Too Far," Charles W. Socarides, M.D., Adam Margrave Books, Phoenix, Ariz., page 249.¹³

Commentary:

What Feminists Say

If a man sleeps with a woman and has second thoughts about it later on, they call it "fear of commitment."

If a woman sleeps with a man and has second thoughts about it later on, they call it "date rape."

If a man gets drunk and sleeps with a woman, they hold him responsible for his actions.

If a woman gets drunk and sleeps with a man, they hold him responsible for her actions.

When men judge women based on their looks, they call it "lookism," "sexism" and "oppression."

When women judge men based on their looks and their salaries, they call it "dating."

When a man says "You have to sleep with me to be an employee," they call it sexual harassment.

When a lesbian says "You have to sleep with me to be a feminist," they call it "body de-colonization" and "political lesbianism."

When a man says "some feminists hate men," he is engaging in stereotypes and bashing.

When a feminist says "all men are potential rapists," she is raising issues.

When feminists lie about rape, sexual harassment, domestic violence, anorexia and bulimia, they are nonetheless educating the public about legitimate issues.

When you point out that feminists lie about rape, sexual harassment, domestic violence, anorexia and bulimia, you are guilty of backlash.

* Charles W. Socarides, *Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far*, (Phoenix: Adam Margrave Books, 1995). Pg. 249

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

When you ask why physical standards should be lowered so women can join the military, they say that it ensures equality.

When you ask why only men are forced to register with the selective service and only men can be forced into combat against their will, they'll say that you are the one who starts all the wars.

When you say that men should not be discriminated against, they will tell you that you hold all the power and privileges.

When you say that you don't feel that way, they will point out rich men you don't even know.

When you say that women in your work place have equal pay and equal numbers and no longer deserve special breaks and special promotions, they will cite some statistics from someplace else.

If you say you are afraid of a violent woman, they will laugh at you and send you away without help.

If you protect yourself from a violent woman, they will say that violence against women is always wrong, no matter what.

If a woman accuses a Republican nominee of sexual harassment, they say "Why would she lie?"

If several women accuse a Democratic president of sexual harassment, they say "She probably lied."

If they want access to a predominantly male organization, club, or school, they say that "diversity" is good.

If they want to keep men out of a predominantly female organization, club, or school, they say segregation is good.

When a woman accuses a man of child abuse during a divorce or custody battle, they say "Believe the children."

When the children themselves say they weren't abused, they don't believe the children.

When a woman cannot support her children, they say we should raise taxes on everyone to set up more programs to help her.

When a man cannot support his children, they say "Revoke the deadbeat's license and throw him in jail."

When a man denies his children support money, they say he should be punished.

When a woman denies her children a relationship with a warm and loving father, by thwarting his visitation rights, they say it's a "non-traditional family."

When an unwed father wants custody of his child, they say "Think of the best interests of the children."

When a mother wants custody of her child, they say "Don't punish a woman just because she works."

If a man starts a statement with "All women are ..." he is using a stereotype.

If a feminist starts a statement with "All men are ..." she is using a metaphor.¹⁴

The "Myth" of Hysteria?

Part One: Satanic Panic

In the early 1980s, bizarre accusations by a handful of women spurred a nationwide panic that day-care centers were infiltrated by child molesters who practiced "ritual abuse" and worshiped the devil. The McMartin Preschool case was launched by a woman later diagnosed as paranoid schizophrenic. A similar panic was launched in Kern County, California, by a woman already diagnosed as delusional.

In saner times, their accusations might have been debunked. But they fell on fertile ground among social workers of the day. Many of these social workers had feminist sympathies and had investigated incest and rape cases. Documentation and their own writings show that ritual abuse believers think that virtually any accusation must be true. They also believe any denial -- including children themselves denying they were molested -- is a sign of being "in denial."

The social workers perfected techniques for getting children to agree to accusations made by delusional adults. Videotapes of their interviews with children show that they endlessly badgered, bullied and ridiculed the children until the kids began parroting whatever charges the social workers wanted them

to make. These videos show how flawed and leading the interviews are, and have become the best evidence used by the *defense.*

But before it was learned just how coercive and leading these techniques were, a nationwide panic sprang up. Parents joined in, seeing ordinary things such as diaper rash and bed-wetting to be signs of "ritual abuse." Thousands of innocent people have been accused and dragged through humiliating trials. Many innocent people are serving life sentences. And "ritual abuse" investigations are enthusiastically supported by many leading feminists, including Gloria Steinem.

One interesting fact to note. Among parents stampeded into seeing signs of ritual abuse, women are the overwhelming majority.*

Part Two: Witch hunt

In Salem, Massachusetts, 20 men and women were executed during a witchcraft panic sparked by the bizarre accusations of three young females.

Part Three: False Memory Syndrome

Paralleling the rise of the Satanic Panic is the popularity of a questionable therapy called "Recovered Memory Therapy." Its practitioners claim that severe abuse is forgotten almost as soon as it occurs. They say that girls can be raped every week, from infancy to young adulthood, and not even realize it. To "recover" memories of abuse, they subject their patients to mind-altering drugs, hypnosis, cult-like isolation from society, searches for "body memories" and other questionable and dangerous techniques. Scientific tests show these techniques can create false memories. In fact, Recovered Memory techniques are even used by some people to recover "memories" of previous lives or being abducted by flying saucers. However, many therapists convince their patients that they have been raped and abused by their parents. This leads to thousands of false charges that have sent innocent people to prison, destroyed families, and driven some patients and accused parents to suicide. Despite its questionable nature and destructive outcome, recovered

memory therapy is enthusiastically supported by many leading feminists, including Gloria Steinem.

And one interesting fact to note. Some men recover false memories. But the overwhelming majority of patients recovering false memories are women.†

Part Four: Multiple Personality Disorder

The 1980s also saw an explosion in the diagnosis of "multiple personalities." The usual pattern is that a doctor who believes in multiple personalities will tell a confused and vulnerable patient that she has other personalities she isn't aware of. The patient is told she must let these "alters" out or she will never get well. Mind-numbing drugs and coercive therapies are used on those who don't comply. And therapists often use recovered memory therapy to uncover "memories" of other personalities. The diagnosis is coming under increasing skepticism in the psychiatric community, especially because so many "alters" develop memories of satanic cults and past lives.

One interesting fact to note: while some men are diagnosed as multiple personalities, the overwhelming majority of those who act out multiple personalities are women.‡

Part Five: Munchausen's Syndrome

In this bizarre psychological malady, patients will deliberately pretend to suffer serious injury or trauma in order to gain attention from friends, strangers, doctors and others. Some have shaved their heads and gone on starvation diets to mimic the effects of cancer. Some undergo surgeries they don't need. Others will tell people shocking tales of personal tragedy and loss that turn out to be untrue. The dupe neighbors and social workers into lavishing them with comfort and sympathy.

One interesting fact to note: the overwhelming majority of patients with Munchausen's Syndrome are women.§

* (Source: "Satan's Silence," by Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker.)

† (Source: "Making Monsters" by Richard Ofshe and Ethan Watters, and "The Myth of Repressed Memory" by Elizabeth Loftus and Katherine Ketcham.)

‡ (Source: "Making Monsters" by Richard Ofshe and Ethan Watters.)

§ (Source: *Patient or Pretender?* by Marc D. Feldman, M.D., and Charles V. Ford, M.D.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Part Six: Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy

In a related condition, patients use someone else as the victim in order to attract sympathy for themselves. This often involves a mother who might give a child low doses of poison in order to rush the child to the hospital and be seen and admired as a caring mother. Others will partially smother their babies in order to revive them. Before they are found out, these women often are admired as strong, courageous women endlessly devoted to a sick child. They thrive on this image and torture the child repeatedly in order to bask in the acclaim.

One interesting fact to note: the overwhelming majority of patients with Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy are women.*

Dating the Rapist

The Date Rape crusade has led to an interesting phenomenon. Some women are coming to believe that they were "raped" by men they later willingly dated again. They come to believe, after the fact, that sexual encounters they willingly and consciously agreed to were really "rape."

One interesting fact to note: virtually all of the people who can be convinced that a consensual sexual encounter was "rape" are women.

Epilogue

In Women's Studies courses across the nation, professors are teaching that women have a special "women's way of knowing." This special way of knowing does not have to depend on linear thinking, on proof, empirical research, evidence, reproducible results, verification or documentation. It doesn't depend on anything except a woman believing that a certain thing is so. Each year, thousands of more Women's Studies graduates go out into the world trained in the doctrine that reality is simply what a woman thinks it is.

Welcome to Salem. The trials are about to begin.¹⁵

From Chauvinism to Patriarchy

In the old days, feminists used to accuse men of "male chauvinism" and call them "male chauvinist pigs." Today the "in" term is "patriarchy."

Why the switch? One possible reason is that the accusation of chauvinism can cut both ways. "Chauvinism" means a fanatical devotion to a cause, nation, etc., or unreasoning devotion to one's race, gender, etc., with contempt for other races, genders, and so on. Certainly many of today's feminists are chauvinistic about their gender and display contempt for men.

Feminists accusing men of chauvinism was often a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Accusing someone of chauvinism carries with it the implied judgment that chauvinism is wrong. And if chauvinism is wrong, feminists would have to explain why they tolerate or engage in feminist chauvinism.

Switching to "patriarchy" gets around these problems. "Patriarchy" is a gender-specific accusation.

Moreover, "chauvinism" might be simply an individual trait. But the accusation of "patriarchy" is broadly [levelled] against entire societies or groups. It gives feminists a way to accuse every man in any given culture of the "offense" of being part of the patriarchy. It also gives feminist a way to blame men for the sins and omissions of women. You can point out that female rulers like Catherine the Great were as militarist, imperialist or bloodthirsty as any male ruler. But feminist will reply that such women were working within a "patriarchal" system. So even though they were absolute monarchs with the power of life and death over their subjects, the tyranny committed by women is pinned on men. (On the other hand, any historical woman who did something that feminists admire is not considered part of any patriarchal system. She is called a pioneer, an early feminist, etc.)

Patriarchy can even be used to blame men for child abuse and child murder committed by women. One feminist recently made this claim when the subject of child abuse came up. She simply said that abusive mothers were powerless women living in a patriarchal system. (Never mind that, in relation to the children, the mothers were the ones with all the power.)

* (Source: *Patient or Pretender?* by Marc D. Feldman, M.D., and Charles V. Ford, M.D.)

We know how childhood abuse can lead to later violence. Look at how women treated children traditionally, and then ask yourself who "starts all the wars."¹⁶

MARCH 1996

It's Always the Man's Fault

When men do something wrong, blame the men.

And when women do something wrong ... blame the men.

That's a recurrent theme among some feminists. Here are recent examples.

First, Blame Men for What Women Do

On the Usenet, one woman wrote:

Anytime a woman disrespects a man by using him as a wallet with legs this is a result of our male dominated society socializing them to act this way.

Thus it's not her fault that she reduced men to the status of an object. It was "male dominated society" that's at fault.

And if she didn't have either the moral foundation or the intellectual faculties to avoid this trap, there is probably a way to shift the blame for that to men, as well.

The next post follows a similar pattern:

[...] Attributing flaws ... to American women is only half the story without attributing the same flaws to American men. In other words, if it is true that American women are "materialistic", can that really exist without the support of American men, i.e. it would be amusing to discover how many American women go out on a first date without the guy boring her to death with information about his "boat" and ski trips to wherever on the company jet.

So, if a man is materialistic and greedy, it's the man's fault. And if a woman is materialistic it's ... the man's fault!

Second: If One Man does Something Wrong, Blame All Men

While feminists will hold men responsible for what women do, some men will hold all men responsible for the sins of any individual man. For example:

Today, March 8 is International Women's Day... If you aren't part of the solution you are part of the problem... A man who witnesses or knows about male violence or discrimination against women and doesn't report it as guilty as the perpetrator of the crime.

We wonder what would happen if society asked feminist to live by the same rules they expect the rest of us to follow. So:

- If a feminist sees another feminist making anti-male statements and does nothing to stop it, she is just as guilty as the perpetrator.
- If a feminist knows that feminist organizations are spreading false, pseudo-scientific studies and does not to stop it, she is just as guilty as the people who fomented the original lies.
- If a feminist knows that false accusations of rape, sexual harassment and child molestation are made against men and does nothing to stop the "all men are rapist" hysteria, then she is just as guilty as someone who makes a false accusation.

And so on.

Third: No Matter What Men Do, it's Wrong

CBS News correspondent Rita Braver wrote a Washington Post editorial criticizing the new Michelle Pfeiffer/Robert Redford film "Up Close and Personal." Braver slams the movie because it shows an older, experienced male executive mentoring a younger woman: "It wasn't billed as a horror movie, but it sure scared the heck out of me. ... It says that women are dopes who can succeed only if older, wiser men direct their every move. Not only does (the man tell the woman) what to think and what to say, he also tells her what to wear. ... The point is that just as the going gets tough, (the man) arrives on the scene to speak slowly and steadily into (her) earpiece and leads her through her live shots. (Her) managed performance results in her becoming a famous network anchorwoman."^{*}

But not to long ago, the Post ran a piece about how women in the legal profession face hardships because more men *don't*

[Author was Abraham Aizenman]
[Posted on 8 Mar 1996 00:27:15 -0500]

^{*} (Rita Braver, "Up Close and Misleading," *Washington Post*, March 14, 1996, page A27.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

mentor them. So if a man mentors a woman, it's bad. And if a man doesn't mentor a woman ... it's bad.

Some people might object that feminism is not monolithic so it is unfair to compare these two opposite views.

But feminism **is** monolithic in one important manner: bashing men. No matter **what** men do, it is going to be decried as wrong. No matter what one individual man does, he is going to be blamed for the sins of other men. And no matter what women do, feminists are going to find a way to blame men for it.¹⁷

Justice, Blind and Deaf: The Moon Case

The recent trial of football star Warren Moon shows just one of the outcomes of the belief that "It's always the man's fault."

He was accused of assault in a July 18 fight in which his wife, Felicia, received scratches and bruises.

Felicia pleaded with prosecutors to drop the charges, testifying that she had started the fight and several others with her husband. However, the trial took place in Texas, which is one of more than 40 states that have eliminated spousal privilege -- the right not to testify against one's spouse. So Felicia had to testify.

She then told the court that she suffers from episodes of "explosive rage" and had provoked her husband at least three times by throwing things at him. She testified that their fights "would be a result of something being thrown at him. ... I once shattered a glass cabinet. It would be the result of something I had done to get his attention. He's just not the kind of person to get excited about something. It aggravates me."

Neither Felicia Moon nor her husband held him entirely blameless. Both had damaged their marriage and their children with their disputes, she said. And Warren Moon said he once punched his wife in the leg after she hit him with a mop handle and tried to hit him a second time. They told the jury that neither husband nor wife was blameless, but that Warren Moon was not the sole person at fault.

She said her husband had been taking the blame to prevent her "dark secrets" from getting out.

She said she started the July 18 fight by throwing a three-pound candlestick at her husband, hitting him in the back during an argument over her \$160,000 in credit-card debts. When he tried to calm her down, she kned him in the groin.

She received scratches and bruises in the struggle that ensued, but testified that her husband never hit her. Still, he was the one charged, and could have faced a year in jail.

Warren Moon was acquitted.

But the prosecutors weren't satisfied with the verdict. They defended their "no-drop" policy, a policy now in effect in jurisdictions across the nation. The policy means they will pursue domestic violence charges even if a spouse does not want them to. But if the Moon case is any indication, a no-drop policy means the man will automatically be charged whenever there is evidence or claim of violence -- regardless of who initiated it. And it means the woman will be presumed to be the victim and will not face charges.

"I make no apologies for prosecuting," prosecutor Mike Elliott said Thursday. "I would prosecute this case with these facts 100 times again." He meant that he would prosecute **Warren** Moon again. But he had a woman in his courtroom who repeatedly testified under oath that she was physically abusive. Her statements are on record, a virtual confession of abuse.

And she will never face charges. For women who abuse, the "no-drop" policy is a "no-starter."

Felicia Moon testified that prosecutors just weren't interested in hearing about her role in escalating the conflict.

Justice is blind. Seems that it is deaf, too.*

(Sources: "From Football Star's Wife, A Reluctant, Painful Story," *The Washington Post*, Feb. 21, 1996, page A3; and the *Associated Press*.)¹⁸

Killed by a False Rape Charge (Not, alas, a Reprint)

The last issue of MANifesto told of Eddie Polec, a Philadelphia teen killed after he was falsely accused of a rape that never occurred.

* (Sources: "From Football Star's Wife, A Reluctant, Painful Story," *The Washington Post*, Feb. 21, 1996, page A3; and the *Associated Press*.)

Sadly, that type of false accusation is not unique. In addition to men and women whose lives are ruined by false accusations of rape or molestation, there still exists a brand of vigilante justice that doesn't wait for the courts.

John Baumgardner was executed on Nov. 17, 1994, in a Fairfax, Va., shopping mall. His sole "crime" was to be picked at random for a false accusation of stalking and rape.

It began when Sheron Montrey told her boyfriend, Louis Raia, that a man named "Tony" had been routinely raping her. She said she had dated him, and he refused to break it off. He threatened to kill her and her family if she did not regularly meet him at a Bennigan's restaurant so he could take her to his car in the parking lot and rape her, she said.

She said she had been meeting with him this way once a week for 18 months, to be raped.

Louis Raia got a .380 semiautomatic pistol and went to the restaurant with Montrey. She picked out a man she said was "Tony." The protective boyfriend shot him in the back three times.

They were quickly caught and quickly confessed. He was sentenced to 30 years. She was sentenced to 27. But solving the murder did not end the mystery of why Montrey picked out Baumgardner.

Afterward, she was unable to describe the face of the man she supposedly had dated and who had supposedly raped her once a week for a year and a half. She was wrong about how tall he was. She was wrong about the beer he drank, the cigarettes he smoked, whether he wore cologne, what kind of car he drove. She didn't know his last name.

Police and private detectives could find no one who had ever seen them together, not one bit of evidence that Montrey and Baumgardner had ever met, much less dated. Her own attorney publicly admits he doubts her tale of rape and stalking.

So, now, does Louis Raia, the man sentenced to 30 years for pulling the trigger. Montrey once introduced him to a little boy she said was her son, and showed pictures of her "daughter." But Montrey has no children.

When men are accused of rape, assault or sexual harassment, some feminists ask,

"Why would she lie?" Thus the inability to immediately explain her motives is taken as proof her accusations are true.

But if we don't know why Montrey lied, we know that she had a bizarre history of doing so. It came out in her trial. She had invented numerous pregnancies and abortions. At age 10, she claimed she was sexually assaulted by a high-school boy, but she recanted when the facts did not add up.

Still, there are feminists who fight the very idea that an accusation might be false. They say that such talk is part of a "backlash," and the "War on Women." Well perhaps it's time to take a look at the real corpses in this war, like Eddie Polec and Baumgardner. And to think of Baumgardner's little boy, a toddler now growing up without a father. (Source: "Dead Wrong," by John W. Fountain, *The Washington Post*, March 24, 1996, page F1.)¹⁹

This is Equity?

A group of women in Congress is pushing the so-called "Women's Health Equity Act," a package of bills that would funnel more public money into research on breast and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis and other diseases that afflict mostly or only women.

Mixed with worthwhile projects such as outlawing female genital mutilation are others that seek to preserve and extend women's special privilege of living longer than men. In the name of "equity," Democratic Congresswoman Nita Lowey of New York wants to increase breast cancer research 70 percent, spending \$575 million on it (without, of course, any similar increase in spending on prostate cancer.)

In the name of "equity" the bill calls for devoting more of our money to discriminatory programs for women scientists only – including programs to help them find mentors. (Remember the old feminist argument that "what if the person who could find a cure for cancer is a woman?" Well, what if the person who could find a cure for breast cancer is a man – and he's shut out of the program?)

One of the bill's sponsors seems to think that not giving women special treatment constitutes warfare against women. Or, as she puts it, "Women's issues have never been under such a serious assault," says

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Democratic Congresswoman Carolyn Maloney of New York. So if we don't agree to extend your advantage, that puts you under assault?

Notable in the bill is its emphasis on spending more to treat osteoporosis. While this disease affects both men and women, it is usually a disease of aging: you usually have to live a long time to get it. So, with men dying about seven years before women, what is the way to establish "equity"? Help save the lives of men? No. Improve the lives women.

Among the other sexists supporting this bill are:

Patricia Schroeder, D-Colorado (but you knew she would be.)

Louise Slaughter, D-New York

Sue Kelly, R-New York

Patsy Mink, D-Hawaii

Lynn Woolsey, D-California²⁰

A Bloody Gender Feminist at The Washington Post

A column on men donating blood to the Red Cross recently gave The Washington Post a chance to flaunt its gender-feminist sympathies.

Columnist Jennifer Frey noted that men often donate blood as a way of getting a no-cost AIDS test. If their blood turns up HIV positive, they are notified.

How does the Red Cross feel about men doing this? They love it. It has brought in great quantities of donated blood. Red Cross officials told Frey they fully support the practice and hope she'd publicize it.

So, here we have a case of men doing good for others while doing good for themselves. What's a feminist to do?

If you're a Post columnist, you'll find a way to bash the entire male gender, employing sweeping stereotypes in the process. Placing these comments in a column in the Style section allows you to get away with gender stereotypes and bashing under the guise of joking -- though that excuse would not have protected any man who aimed similar hostile stereotypes at women or other protected groups.

Taking a gender feminist stance, Frey said the blood donations represent "empirical evidence of a fundamental difference between the sexes." She offers several possible

explanations for this difference. The first one she suggests is that men are more compassionate, adding that "This is a scientific inquiry, and we must dispassionately consider all scenarios, however absurd."

Other possibilities she suggests:

Men take this roundabout route to AIDS testing because "Men are incapable of confronting unpleasantness or conflict." Men, she says, will stay in an unpleasant relationship rather than go through the conflict of breaking up. (Which puts her at odds with all her sisters who accuse men of being unemotionally attached heels who fear commitment and break off at a moment's notice. Inconsistent? No, there is quite a bit of consistency -- in bashing men.)

"Men have trouble acknowledging error or frailty."

"Men are cheaper." (She doesn't tell us who picked up the tab on her last date.)

"Men are self delusional. Wow, we are getting to the heart of it."

If you have no trouble acknowledging the error and frailty of Frey's thinking, you can write to the Washington Post at the address below. You might stress several facts: Will the reporter and editors who worked on this piece also handle feminist issues such as sexual harassment, women's pay, feminist political candidates, etc.? If so, how can they expect to have any credibility or journalistic integrity after embracing a batch of anti-male rhetoric and gender stereotypes? The Post isn't all that open about printing letters that note its pro-feminist bias, but at least you will let them know you're watching. Letters must have your signature, home address, home and business telephones:

Letters to the Editor

The Washington Post

1150 15th St. NW

Washington, D.C. 20071²¹

"60 Minutes" Prison Rape Segment

The TV news magazine "60 Minutes" deserves your support for an enlightened report it did March 3 on the rape of men in prison. Host Mike Wallace noted that many people feel that inmates deserve to be raped. Well, no one deserves to be raped, and that includes men who are in prison for minor,

non-violent offenses, innocent men who were convicted, and men sent to prison because of false charges of abuse made during custody disputes, etc. The double punishment of prison rape is unconscionable -- especially because many victims acquire AIDS this way.

If you wish to praise "60 Minutes" for this segment, write to:

60 Minutes-CBS News
524 West 57th St.
New York, N.Y. 10019

Meantime, you might note that the preview for the latest Dan Aykroyd movie (I can't remember the title, but it's about basketball fans) has a joke about prison rape in it. Maybe Aykroyd and the movie studio deserve a few letters about this. And maybe they *don't* deserve our ticket money.²²

Just Opinion:

Hear Me Roar

You say that you need protection from words.

You say that you need protection from "unwanted sexual advances."

You say that you need protection from photographs of women in bikinis.

You say that people who disagree with you are creating "a hostile working environment" against you.

You say that someone who calls you a name or questions your views has committed "verbal battering."

You say that the stress of working with people who didn't like you caused so much trauma that you need therapy and prescription drugs.

You say that you have been "raped" by words.

You say that you need "a safe and nourishing environment in which to grow."

And you say that the only reason people don't like you is that they're afraid of strong women?²³

Let's Do the Feminist Dance of Denial

How can some feminists hold onto the moral high ground even while wallowing in the depths of gender hatred? Easy. Just do the Feminist Dance of Denial:

Step One: Feminist says that feminists are free of bigotry.

Step Two: Feminist is shown an example of extreme feminist bigotry/hatred/stereotyping, etc.

Step Three: Feminist says it's just an exception and doesn't count.

Step Four: Feminist is shown lots of examples of feminist hatred.

Step Five: Feminist declares that you must be a sexist for discussing any flaws in feminism.

Step Six: Go back to Step One. (If need be, the Dance can be moved to a "safe and nurturing environment" of other feminists, where facts are not allowed to interfere.)

Another version of the Dance:

Step One: Feminist believes that every accusation of rape/sexual assault/sexual harassment must be true.

Step Two: Feminist is told about an accusation that turned out to be false.

Step Three: Feminist says it's just an exception and doesn't count.

Step Four: Feminist is shown lots of examples of false accusations, some of which destroyed the lives of those who were falsely accused.

Step Five: Feminist declares that such stories are part of the "backlash" or the "war against women."

Step Six: Go back to Step One.²⁴

The "Moderate" Feminists

[Note: Below is a letter that appeared on a newsgroup about feminism. The writer says that "Only a small minority of 'radical' feminists exist." Following the letter is my reply.]

[Begin letter]

I am pretty new to this group, but there is one thing that it did not take me long to notice. Many people here seem to think that all feminists are alike. This is categorically untrue. Also, most of the people who hold this view seem to think that all feminists are anti-male, separatists, lesbians, or some other thing. These man-hating, lesbian, or whatever feminists are not all that common.

In my experience, most feminists like men and care very much about how the feminist movement (if there still is such a movement) or how feminism affects men. I also know many women who claim to not be feminists simply because their image of a feminist is a man-hating lesbian. This image is so misleading that it is almost funny.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

There are all kinds of feminists with all kinds of different goals. Most true feminists would have similar goals however. Only a small minority of "radical" feminists exist. In fact, using the word radical to talk about the man-hating lesbian feminists is misleading. Radical feminists differ from other feminists in several different areas; namely, they disagree with other feminists about the source of sexism and they have different methods for eradicating sexism (and their methods are not killing off all the men, or becoming lesbians). Obviously, some radical feminists do hate men or are lesbians, but so there are man-hating, lesbian liberal feminists, Marxist feminists, post modern feminists, etc.

I am sure that the goal of some feminists is to give women more rights or to oppress men. Perhaps some feminists are vengeful, but most are not. And many women are feminists but do not call themselves feminists because of the all the negative stuff associated with the word. Anyway, I just wanted to have my say about this, which is what the newsgroup is for... so here it is if anyone cares.

Jenny

[End letter, begin response:]

Jenny.

Many feminists say that the "extremist" feminists are just a small group that no one takes seriously. However, I'd like to offer a couple of contrasting points:

Point 1.) So-called extremist feminists have a great deal of power and influence and a great many admirers. There is a man-bashing book called "Men Are Not Cost Effective," which stereotypes all men as violent criminals and proposes -- in deadly earnest -- to put a special tax on just men. This book just entered its second printing. *Someone* is buying all those books. These so-called extremists appeal to more than just a small group.

I remember the comments from a person who witnessed the reaction when Andrea Dworkin came to campus. Other supposedly moderate feminist speakers had drawn small audiences and lukewarm responses. For Dworkin, the women were packed into the aisles, along the back walls and out the door, and they cheered wildly for this anti-male extremist. It seems that some of the extreme feminists are far more popular than the supposed mainstream.

You can read the book "Professing Feminism," about Women's Studies courses. Often the extremists shout down and intimidate all contrasting viewpoints. Extremist feminists hold students' grades hostage until they conform to the proper dogma.

It is said that "extremists" are few and on the fringe. In fact they are in positions of power and influence on campuses and elsewhere.

Point 2.) Even the moderate feminists are pretty extreme. Just because there is an extreme Ku Klux Klan, that doesn't mean everyone else on the political right is a moderate. A step down from the Klan extremists you still have ultra-conservatives. But, according to conventional wisdom, a step down from extremist feminists you have the "moderates."

But anyone who is blatantly vocal about wanting to discriminate against me deserves the title of sexist as far as I am concerned. Anyone who openly advocated discrimination against black people today probably wouldn't be called a moderate. Pro-discrimination feminists, however, seem to get away with it.

Gloria Steinem has been a big supporter of "recovered memory therapy" and the belief that Satanists are invading our day-care centers. To further these quack conspiracy theories, Steinem made allies with some of the looniest fringe groups on the right. Steinem contributed money and public support to a group that claims it was the U.S. government (not militia groups) that bombed the federal building in Oklahoma City. Steinem even helped finance a dig into the supposed "tunnels" under the McMartin Preschool. (Both facts and more about Steinem are documented in the book "Satan's Silence," which is written by a feminist, Debbie Nathan.) Now, embracing loony conspiracy theories and consorting with extremist groups would cause most other political figures to be labeled extreme.

The label of "moderate" can be stretched pretty far. I'm sure the female personnel directors who blatantly refused to give me information on job openings because I am a man could don their moderate mufti. I'm sure the women in my workplace who refer to men as "apes" and "cavemen" would pass muster as moderates, because that type of gender slur isn't taken seriously unless it comes from a man.

But frankly, I wouldn't call anyone a moderate if they advocate gender discrimination. Would you?²⁵

North Koreans Hold All the Power

Feminists say that "men hold all the power" or "men hold most of the power." They point out that most Congress members, business owners and media executives are male. Then they extrapolate this into an illogical conclusion: if you are male, you belong to the class that holds all the power. That concept is used to demand quotas, special breaks and special rights for women,

on the grounds that *any* woman is automatically at a disadvantage against any male -- even if the facts suggest otherwise. Thus privileged, upper-class and upper-middle-class women whose families often paid their way through Ivy League schools are demanding that they get an "even playing field" against lower-class and lower-middle-class men who did not have the advantages those feminists had.

Let's use their logic and look at North Korea. Notice something about the leaders. They're all North Koreans.

That means that in North Korea, North Koreans must hold all the power.

The average North Korean might be barely scraping by -- but they are North Korean. That means they hold all the power. They are responsible for everything his government ever did, as part of this class.

All the leaders of China are Chinese. So therefore, Chinese hold all the power. Let's not bother looking at individual people or facts. Let's not bother asking whether the average Chinese citizen has rights. Let's just use generalizations: Chinese hold all the power, therefore any Chinese person holds all the power.

How about Russia? Some of the rulers there are not ethnically Russian, but most of them are. So "Russians hold most of the power." There are Jews in Russia. And because they are Russian, let's conclude that they hold all the power.

If this makes sense to you, congratulations: you'll have no problem with the rest of gender feminist philosophy.²⁶

Violence Against Women Act and other statutes that make violent or harassing acts into special crimes only when men commit them.

Oh, by the way, the feminists billed this as a march *against* discrimination.

Go figure.²⁷

Raked by Catt's Claws

One of the ways that some feminists rewrite history is to portray white women as staunch opponents of racism.

White women would have banished racism, so the reasoning goes, except that they were held back by the white male power structure.

It's a handy little scenario to bandy about in today's political climate. It makes for some nice novels and movies like "Fried Green Tomatoes." It helps white feminists paint themselves as victims and horn their way into affirmative action programs meant for racial minorities. It helps feminists drive a further wedge into our society as they play the politics of blame and resentment.

It's handy. But it just isn't true.

The Klan had women's branches -- filled with women who wanted equal rights for themselves, but not for Jews, blacks, Catholics and foreigners.

When their men were away at war, Southern women ran the plantations. They did not emancipate their slaves.

And now one of the heroines of modern feminism is coming under renewed scrutiny for her undeniably racist beliefs.

Carrie Chapman Catt was a crusader for women's suffrage. She founded the League of Women Voters, which today still sponsors political debates at the highest levels of national politics. Catt planned the state-by-state strategy that helped win passage of the woman's suffrage amendment in 1920. If you're a woman, you owe it to Catt that you can vote.

At least, if you're a white woman.

In pushing for her right to vote, Catt argued that "White supremacy will be strengthened, not weakened, by women's suffrage." Her campaign for the vote was filled with assertions that "uneducated immigrants" should not be allowed to vote. She referred to Indians as "savages."

APRIL 1996

Unclear on the Concept

On April 14, feminists gathered in San Francisco to stage a political rally. One goal was to defend and promote anti-male discrimination in the form of affirmative action, set-asides and special breaks. Gloria Steinem and Patricia Ireland were among the participants who harshly condemned a California initiative to end discrimination based on race and gender in state education, employment and contracting. Another goal was to continue their successful push for gender discrimination in law enforcement -- support for the

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Her supporters are trying a familiar tactic: blaming "society" for her shortcomings. Catt was just a product of her times, they say. (How many of these feminists are willing to forgive men who were "products of their times"?)

The controversy over Catt's well-documented racism is flaring again after her alma mater, Iowa State University, named a building after her: Carrie Chapman Catt Hall. The NAACP wants the name changed, to disavow racism in all its forms.

Catt's racism affirms a few points that skeptics of feminism have already realized. Bigotry and feminism are not mutually exclusive propositions. And bigotry within feminism is nothing new.²⁸

Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries

"Women just can't think as well as men."
"Women are weak and easily manipulated."
"In most couples, it's the man who does the brainwork, and the woman follows."

Do these attitudes strike you as sexist? As harmful toward women?

Then ask Christina Hays of Oregon.

Loyd and Christina Hays are members of the fundamentalist Church of the First Born.

The Hays had a son, Tony, who had lymphocytic leukemia, a treatable form of the disease.

They decided to treat the boy with prayer rather than seek medical treatment. Tony died. He was 7 years old.

Both parents went on trial.

A jury in Albany, Oregon, convicted Loyd Hays of criminally negligent homicide for not seeking medical treatment for the boy. Loyd Hays is awaiting sentencing.

But Christina Hays was acquitted. Jurors said she was "under the influence of her husband."

Both of these parents were responsible for this child -- supposedly. But in the eyes of the law, only the man is being held to that responsibility.

Once again a woman has been cleared of wrongdoing because she is not seen as innately responsible as a man. If she did something wrong, there was a man to blame.

It is rare -- perhaps nonexistent -- for a man to be acquitted of criminal wrongdoing on the grounds that his wife controlled his thoughts. But Christina Hays joins the list of

women acquitted or never charged because of their gender. Add her name to the list of women who have claimed the PMS Defense, post-partum depression, "battered wife syndrome," and other defenses that appeal to the concept of uniquely feminine mental defects or shortcomings.

If people had suggested that Christina Hays not be allowed to own property or vote because she was incapable of thinking for herself, they would be vilified as the worst sort of sexists. But Christina Hays failed at something more important -- seeing to the well-being of her child. And her excuse is that she was "under the influence of her husband."

"Women just can't think as well as men."
"Women are weak and easily manipulated."
"In most couples, it's the man who does the brainwork, and the woman follows."

Do these attitudes strike you as sexist? Sure. But are they harmful toward women? Not when it's the men who are going to prison.²⁹

Stalkers, Sexual Predators, and Power Rangers

Maybe you heard of the case a few months ago about a 9-year-old boy who was being charged under an anti-stalking law because he repeatedly phoned a girl's house.

It gets weirder.

Now a 12-year-old New Jersey boy is being charged under a "sexual predators" law. His supposed crime: fondling his 8-year-old stepbrother in the bathtub. He might be forced to register as a sex offender for the rest of his life.

The case stems from a batch of laws known collectively as "Megan's Law." The well-intentioned but flawed laws were passed as a quick reaction to the horrible death of 7-year-old Megan Kanka. A convicted sex offender is accused of killing her.

The laws were designed to protect children from repeat sexual offenders.

But they are being applied to a 12-year-old boy who is described as "neurologically impaired."

The circumstances bear looking into. The 12-year-old was accused by his stepmother. She said he fondled her son, the 8-year-old.

Step families are often under a lot of stress. Parents feel more protective toward

their "flesh and blood" children than to the "baggage" that comes along when they remarry. The possibilities for false or exaggerated charges ought to be considered before passing a lifetime sentence.

And the idea of a 12-year-old having to register for the rest of his life as a sexual predator is absolutely absurd.

Megan's Law faces legal questions and constitutional challenges because it was slapped together as an emotional reaction with political overtones. Legislatures ought to take the time to write solid, well-reasoned laws. And then they should apply them reasonably. Branding a 12-year-old as a lifetime sexual offender is not an example of either.³⁰

The Score is Men, 35 Million; Women, Zero

April marks the month that the 35-millionth young man was compelled to register for the Selective Service (the draft.)

Although the draft has officially ended, young men are still required to sign up so that they can be called up quickly when the draft is reinstated.

The draft was supposedly suspended after the Viet Nam war. It's interesting to note that modern feminism began flexing its political clout at about the same time. In the intervening years, woman have become the majority on campuses nationwide -- partly by demanding special breaks and supports befitting their status as a "minority."

And while they are the majority on campus and are demanding "equality" just about anywhere it looks good to them, they are a minority on the rolls of the Selective Service.

Indeed, the score is men, 35 million; women, zero.³¹

Mr. Democrat, The Sexist Senator

Senator Chris Dodd of Connecticut is the General Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In that position, he is heavily involved in the reelection efforts of Bill Clinton and every congressional Democrat.

Dodd has a major voice in shaping Democratic positions. As head of the DNC, Dodd is, in effect, "Mr. Democrat."

Recently, he sought to explain why his Democratic party is attracting more female voters than the Republicans. Senator Dodd put it this way:

"Women are more inclined to think less of themselves and their own immediate needs and more of their families." That translates, he said, into broader support of a government role in guaranteeing things like education and health care.

Senator Dodd is pandering to the divisive gender politics and feminist superiority propaganda that is already is splitting families and tearing us apart.

And this isn't just the opinion of one rogue senator. Dodd is now at the center of Democratic campaign strategy. This type of gender stereotyping is coming from the highest level of the Democratic party.

If you object to Mr. Democrat telling you that you care less about your family or society, then let him know. Below are his Congressional e-mail address and other addresses where you can snail mail him.

If you write him, you might want to stress a couple of points:

Senator Dodd, how dare you denigrate all the hardworking husbands, fathers and sons who are supporting wives, children and elderly parents? Many men provide for their families by working long hours backbreaking, stressful or dangerous jobs. How dare you imply that they think only of their own needs? How dare you insult them just to pander to feminists? How dare you imply that men don't care about education and health care when men are paying most of the taxes to support these programs? And why should we embrace your party when you obviously are trying to make political capital by running us down?

You can write to Senator Sexist at:

Democratic National Committee, 430 S. Capitol St., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003, phone 202-863-8000.

Or

Offices: U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510, phone 202-224-2823

Or

Putnam Park, 100 Great Meadow Road, Wethersfield, Conn. 06109, phone 203-240-3470

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Or e-mail him right now at: sen_dodd@dodd.senate.gov

Please take the time to at least e-mail him your objections. If they get enough input now, perhaps they will drop the man-bashing plank from their platform before the convention.³²

An Usual Case

Rita Gluzman is accused in the brutal axe murder of her estranged husband. Of course, it's not the first time a husband or wife has been charged in a spouse's death.

She's accused of convincing a man to help her carry out her dirty deeds. Not the first time a woman has done that, either.

And authorities say the motive was money -- that she was afraid of losing her financial stake in a company during their divorce. Well, it's hardly the first time a person's life was treated as worth less than a bank account.

But what makes Rita Gluzman unique is that she is the first woman ever charged under a federal law against domestic violence. She has been charged with traveling between states to commit domestic violence.

Many men who are attacked by violent wives or girlfriends seem to have trouble convincing authorities that charges should be brought -- or that they are not the instigators of the violence. In the recent case of football star Warren Moon, Moon's wife testified repeatedly under oath to the abuse she committed against him. But only the man, Warren Moon, was charged. Prosecutors said they would charge Warren Moon again if they had the chance. (They don't, because he was acquitted.) However, they have no intention of charging his wife, who admitted under oath to repeatedly striking her husband during episodes of "explosive rage."

But the Gluzman case marks the first time that federal authorities figured out that women can commit domestic violence. Authorities say Rita Gluzman and her cousin ambushed her husband, Yakov Gluzman, with two axes and then cut his body into 65 pieces. The body was stuffed into ten garbage bags and dumped into the Passaic River in New Jersey. So it is a good sign that our federal authorities can at last recognize

that hacking a man into five dozen pieces might constitute domestic violence.³³

Exceptional Feminists

During child custody disputes, feminists say that children need to be with their mothers ... Except when the mothers want to put the kids in daycare.

Feminists say that discrimination is bad ... Except when it benefits them.

Feminists say that excluding people because of their gender is bad ... Except at women's colleges, in girls' and women's sports, on Take Your Daughter To Work Day ...

Feminists say that gender stereotypes are bad ... Except that all men really *are* potential rapists.

Feminists advocate equal rights ... Except for your right to say things they don't like.

Feminists say that diversity is good ... Except when it means admitting men.

Feminists support affirmative action ... Except when a white woman gets turned away.

Feminists say they advocate equality for everyone ... Except you.³⁴

The Responsibility Gap

On the Internet, one man recently asked why supposedly "moderate" feminists do not speak out more against the extremists. Citing a collection of anti-male quotations, he asked one feminist the following question: "If what you say is true, then where are the voices of these mainstream feminists, condemning or even arguing with the fringe extremists?"

Came the reply:

"We're busy running businesses, teaching in schools and universities, raising families, providing services to our communities, etc.; essentially the same things men are doing. We don't have enough time to devote to everything that needs our attention in our own lives, much less participating in political movements. Or, if we choose to spend our time addressing politi-

cal issues, perhaps others are addressed. I consider myself to be either a mainstream feminist or "equalist", if you prefer (support AA based on economic disadvantage, not gender or race; equal pay; identical standards applied to men and women in custody and CS decisions, equal draft registration requirements, etc.), but choose to spend my "political" time supporting improved educational opportunities for economically or socially disadvantaged kids (yes, girls 'and' boys)."

From replies like this one and many others, it certainly seems like there is a "Responsibility Gap" between the genders. It's common to hear feminists tell men that men are responsible for anything any man anywhere does. Men are told that they have to stop every anti-women (or anti-feminist) act, and quash every anti-female comment or they are just as responsible as the person committing the offense.

Yet when asked, where are the mainstream feminists condemning the extremist feminists, the answer is "We're busy ..."

When it comes to dissenting against their extremist sisters, some feminists will always be "busy."³⁵

MAY 1996

Another One Bites the Dust

Here's a rule of thumb for you: the impact feminist statistics have on society has no correlation to the amount of truth they contain.

That's demonstrated by the fact that the latest feminist study to be debunked has also been a very influential one.

Sociologist Lenore J. Weitzman published "The Divorce Revolution" eleven years ago, claiming to find a huge income gap between men and women after they split up.

In the first year after divorce, women's households suffered a 73 percent drop in their standard of living, while men's households enjoyed a 42 percent rise -- so her study said. That paints a picture of women plunged into hardship and despair while their happy-go-lucky ex-husbands are rolling in money. (Time for more social programs!) And it has given fuel to more than a few anti-male presumptions. ("Marriage must be sheer hell if so many women are willing to

flee into poverty just to get away from the S.O.B.")

Do the math to realize the enormity of what Weitzman was saying. Applying her figures to yearly income, a woman in a middle-class, \$40,000-a-year household would drop to \$10,800. That's right on the poverty line if she is taking care of two children.

Weitzman's study had now been proven to be erroneous, by her own admission. But that should have been evident from the start. Other researchers were finding income gaps, but not on this scale. Most researchers agree woman's standard of living drops about 30 percent after a divorce while it rises only about 10 percent for men.

But it was Weitzman's study that was the big hit. It has been taken up by the news media, the courts, and women's activists. It has been used to support the argument that women deserve a much bigger property settlement because their income supposedly is going to fall so drastically. One researcher found 24 legal appeals and Supreme Court cases that cited her figure, as well as 250 law review articles and 348 social science articles. A search of the Nexis database of publications found more than 175 newspaper and magazine stories citing her figures.

And President Bill Clinton, who wants to be more than just a friend to women, used the statistic in his 1996 budget.

"This has been one of the most widely quoted statistics in recent history," says one expert.

To those trumpeting the study, it didn't seem to matter that Weitzman's results differed greatly from what other researchers were finding. It didn't seem to matter that her results even conflicted with some of her own data! And it didn't seem to matter that she was refusing to make her data available to other researchers. She made a spectacular claim that was disputed other people, a claim that she didn't back up, and still the news media and the courts embraced it as truth.

Now even Weitzman admits her study was wrong.

She says her figures are somehow off because of a weighting error, a mistake made by an assistant, or other factors.

What forced her admission is that Richard R. Peterson, a New York sociologist, gained

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

access to Weitzman's data from computer and paper records archived at Radcliffe College. Ironically, Peterson found that Weitzman's own data supported the figures that other researchers had been citing all along. In fact, Weitzman's showed the gap to be a little bit less than what others were saying: a 27 percent decline in women's post-divorce standard of living and a 10 percent increase in men's.

(Weitzman actually reversed the figures. She had claimed women's standard-of-living levels fell 73 percent, leaving them only 27 percent of the level they had. Now her own figures show that women's levels *stay at* 73 percent of that marriage income meaning they drop by only 27 percent.)

In covering the story, the Associated Press declared: "It was a jaw-dropping statistic, widely influential in the movement to change America's divorce and child-support laws."

Maybe the statistic was jaw-dropping. What's truly amazing, though, is the speed with which the news media uncritically embrace studies like this. Her results were out of sync with what other researchers were finding, but her study is the one that made the headlines. It helped create concepts that now are deemed conventional wisdom, such as the so-called "feminization of poverty." Such misconceptions live on even after the material that originally gave rise to them is debunked.

And even once researchers get their figures straight, there's still the inherent bias of studying the issue so that women are always cast as the victims. If women's standards of living decrease after divorce, the other side of the coin is that their standards of living improve in marriage. We could turn this whole field of study around to investigate how women's living standards increase when they marry. However, this would require us to acknowledge contributions that men make to women's well-being and quality of life. How unfashionable.

Another facet of the issue is that women are routinely awarded child custody during divorce. Of course, with some money going to the extra expense of raising children, their standard of living might take a hit. The feminist position on "equality" seems to be that they want women to have custody of the

children AND equal standards of living and income levels: equality when they want it, and traditional gender privileges when they want it.³⁶

License to Stereotype

The Weitzman study shows how successful feminists have been in getting the news media and others to spread their message. Now they're seeking a truly wacky way of spreading their partisan message, and they want it as public policy paid for with public money.

Feminists and their allies are urging that all marriage certificates carry a warning label telling starry-eyed couples about domestic violence and the laws used to punish it. The latest politician to pander to this sentiment is New Jersey state senator John Adler. (Why yes, he is a Democrat. How did you guess?)

Feminists have managed to portray domestic violence as something that men do to women. Studies show that domestic violence is about equally male and female. (See following item.) But feminists have been pretty successful in promoting the popular image as that of a brutish man and a female victim. So any warning label on marriage certificates might come across more as a warning that says, "Watch out, girlfriend, men are liable to beat the tar out of you."

If feminists ever succeed in putting these labels on marriage certificates, it would say something about the interesting times we live in. On their anniversaries, loving couples could look through their wedding albums and reminisce about the moonlight, the candlelight, the music, and the domestic violence warning on their marriage certificate. That, at least, seems to fit in well with the views of some people that marriage is a social hazard worthy of a warning label, like cigarettes or toxic waste.

But really, why stop there? If marriage brings with it the potential for domestic violence, then birth carries with it the potential for committing all sorts of sin. So why not mark the birth certificates of all boys with the warning: "Caution, potential rapist"? This might help keep the attendants in the hospital nurseries safe from all those potential berserkers in the cribs.

Or better yet, perhaps we could start putting warning labels on feminism: Caution, extreme doses can cause intolerance, bigotry, self-righteousness, close-mindedness and a belief that you are always the innocent victim.³⁷

We Meant "Man"-Datory Punishment!

And if you still cling to that feminist propaganda about domestic violence being a male thing, take a look at what happens when mandatory arrest laws are enacted.

Columnist John Leo reports that "under mandatory arrest laws, a large number of women are now being arrested after domestic battles. In Los Angeles, arrests of women in such cases have almost quadrupled in eight years. In Wisconsin, the number of abusive men referred by the courts for counseling has doubled since 1989, while the number of abusive women referred for counseling increased 12-fold."

Leo cites a front-page story in the Los Angeles Times on the new wave of women arrested for domestic violence: "You could sense that the reporter was grappling with a baffling question: How is it that laws intended to protect women are producing so many arrests of women themselves? Luckily, he was able to come up with three explanations: a backlash against women, spiteful action by police officers who resent mandatory arrest laws, and outright male trickery."

Outright male trickery, as in false reports of abuse, he says. Hmm. Now according to some feminists, just questioning a woman's accusation that she was raped, harassed, or assaulted is an act of backlash -- part of the "War on Women." So now the L.A. Times is accusing some men of making false accusations of abuse.

So maybe the L.A. Times is now engaged in the "War on Men"? Or is staffed by a bunch of backslashers?

The disbelief of the L.A. Times when confronted with abusive women is part of the denial that women are equal to men -- in negative ways. Leo has advice for those in this state of denial:

"Follow the work of the National Family Violence Survey. The original 1975 survey

showed rather high rates of female-on-male domestic violence, but these were fitted to the paradigm and explained as understandable reactions to male violence. But the second survey in 1985 clearly showed equality in turning to violence: In both low-level assaults and severe assaults, only the wife was violent in a quarter of the cases, only the husband in another quarter, both in half of the cases. These findings came from self-reports."

So what's behind the arrests of women when mandatory arrest laws are in place? A conspiracy? A backlash? A War on Women?

No. It's just that some women are violent.

As they say in scientific circles: Well, duh.³⁸

Glad She Cleared That Up

Here are some comments a feminist bigotrix recently posted on the Internet. Note her response when it was suggested to her that her comments seemed bigoted:

"Men oppressed women's freedom for centuries to bolster their position. That's very revealed. ... You are probably some white man worried about losing your position to (ohmygod) a woman or a black or other minority. You would most likely be comfortable with a slave and a woman who does only domestic things and speaks to you only when spoken to. You will lose big time. You men deserve everything you get."

"Look barn boy it's not our fault that we are genetically superior to you. When women saturate the medical professions I'm sure they will study your manly maladies to the extent that women's were studied by men -- probably more so."

"THANK GOODNESS for [women's] movements across the globe that socialize girls to respect themselves for exactly what they are [intelligent] caring sensitive and naturally graceful and beautiful not like fumbling men."

"Why don't you look at what men have done to women all in the name of mythical patriarchal religion and penile protection."

"Clue yourself in. Men have oppressed women by socialization since [before] time was recorded."

(It was pointed out that in any other place except Women's Studies courses, it is difficult to know what happened "since before time was recorded." And when it was sug-

* ("Things that go bump in the home," by John Leo, *U.S. News & World Report* magazine, May 13, 1996, page 25.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

gested to her that her comments showed bigotry, she replied:)

"I am not a [Feminazi] who wants to put men below women. I am in full knowledge of the way we were meant to live in harmony and that means mutual respect between the genders. If it lacks I will oppose the violators-men or women."

Well. Glad she cleared that up.

(Editors note: This woman's comments were posted from a university's computer system. She apparently is another one of those oppressed and downtrodden women attending college.)

(It would be interesting to see what would have happened if male students made these sort of remarks using a university computer system. They might well face sanctions for violating a campus speech code. But not this woman, or the countless others like her who send out similar anti-male comments and propaganda. Apparently the First Amendment now has clauses for first- and second-class citizens.)³⁹

A Feminist Hammer

Recently a young woman with the Internet name of Dkitten27 wrote about an unfortunate tool-time experience: "I recently went to a local hardware store to buy a hammer. Let me tell you that I am small in stature: 5' 100 lbs. and I am also blonde (no I'm not always dingy). Let me also tell you that I work in the parts department of a major motor vehicle company. I know my stuff (even though I am a girl) I also work just as hard as any male in my division. ... This "gentleman" at the hardware store tried to sell me a "woman's hammer". Needless to say I was a little upset - especially after seeing the tool. Pretty white with pink flowers on the handle looked more like a push pin hammer."

This woman's traumatic experience obviously calls for a major response. In the next few days, some or all of the following events should take place:

- The American Association of University Women will issue a major study finding that young girls being offered inappropriate hardware is a major cause of self-esteem problems, and proposes a \$600 million program to fix the prob-

lem. However, courageous members of Congress, determined not to be cowed by the feminist lobby, give them only \$300 million.

- Susan Faludi's new book reveals that offering inappropriate hardware is part of the War on Women.
- Andrea Dworkin declares that all fathers rape their daughters with screwdrivers and ball peen hammers as a ritualistic way of shaming them into subservience.
- The EEOC writes up a report and then investigates the store. It states that offering inappropriate or unwelcome hardware is a form of sexual harassment. All male employees are sent to re-education camps, where they are broken of the habit of referring to "male" and "female" connectors and instead call them "oppressor" and "victim" connectors.
- Feminists take over the store completely. They are appalled to find there are no programs to ensure equality, such as special programs for bringing daughters to work, special mentoring program for women only, special sensitivity-training courses for men only, special speech codes to protect women only, special quotas for women only, special safe and nurturing coffee rooms for women only, and all other things that assure equal treatment. They set up special Women's Studies shop classes to study "the women's way of woodworking," in which they learn how to build furniture that leans to the left. One main point made in these classes is that the current masculine culture of hardware is hard, brutal and destructive and so naturally alienates women's more nurturing nature. Women have not felt welcome in woodworking, they say, because of the unrelenting phalocentric paradigm that informs the parameters -- or whatever. So they demand that the entire field be made more female-friendly.
- To accomplish that goal and get more women into the field, the feminists require the store to start selling hardware more in tune with women's nurturing and ecologically sensitive nature. The store unveils the first line of feminist-approved products: a hammer. It is pretty and white, with pink flowers on the handle, looking more like a push pin hammer.⁴⁰

All Women Are Potential Munchausen Cases?

To most people, Kathy Bush seemed a loving and courageous mother. The Florida

woman's daughter, Jennifer, suffered mysterious illnesses that doctors couldn't quite pin down. Announcing that Jennifer's medical bills exceeded \$3 million, Kathy Bush entered the national debate on health-care costs. Her plight was cited by the White House as an example of out-of-control medical expenses, and she appeared with Hillary Clinton.

Kathy Bush seemed to devote her life to helping her child. But now Kathy Bush is charged with abusing that child. A Florida circuit court judge put the 8-year-old girl in protective custody. Prosecutors say Kathy Bush was deliberately making Jennifer sick. They say the girl had nearly 40 unneeded surgeries and was hospitalized 200 times for conditions that were caused by the mother. One of the things they accuse the mother of: putting excrement in her daughter's surgical tubes.

Psychologists say Kathy Bush is a prime example of "Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy."

It's a bizarre name for a bizarre behavior that is seen almost exclusively in women.

There really are two sets of syndromes: "Munchausen's Syndrome," and "Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy."

A person with "Munchausen's Syndrome" will pretend to suffer an illness or trauma in order to gain attention and sympathy. Some will pretend to have cancer: they will shave their heads and go on starvation diets to mimic the effects of the disease and its treatment. Others claim to have been raped or abused. Some complain of vague illnesses and have unneeded surgeries. They are quite believable, and have conned people into giving them money and enormous amounts of emotional support for conditions that never existed.

And in "Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy" a person uses a proxy -- a substitute victim to undergo the traumatic therapy. This almost always involves a mother making a child sick so the mother can appear to be a courageous, devoted parent and reap the sympathy accorded to someone enduring such a tragedy.

Munchausen's Syndrome seems quite at home in our modern age when victimhood is sainthood and victimhood status has special power. For Munchausen patients, the key to

empowerment is victimhood. They use that status to manipulate other people, to get attention, to evade responsibilities, to get money, to get sympathy, to change and control relationships, and to order the world so that they are the person who must be helped. If it has some points in common with feminism, then it is interesting to note that nearly all Munchausen and Munchausen by Proxy patients are women.

Rape is a primarily male form of abuse, while Munchausen by Proxy is primarily female. But while rape is classified as violence, Munchausen by Proxy -- because it occurs in women -- is classified as a psychiatric illness. But Munchausen by Proxy involves repeated physical abuse against helpless victims. These children are poisoned, strangled, starved, drugged or exposed to filth and germs so they will develop the symptoms the mothers can pass off as a mysterious illness. Dr. Robert Hales, chairman of psychiatry, California Pacific Medical Center, San Francisco, estimates about 8.5 percent of the children who become "proxies" die.

But because the abusers are women, it is an "illness."

It would be interesting to see what feminists would do with Munchausen by Proxy if it were a primarily male thing.

First, they would make sure it is not viewed as an illness. They would say that it is a form of control -- that it involves "typical" male patterns of exerting dominance.

Feminists would launch anti-Munchausen campaigns that would serve as powerful sources of propaganda. Horror stories and emotional reactions would be valued more than facts. Novels and made-for-TV movies would portray Munchausen men as evil rather than sick. As the emotional level escalates, it would become an offense to question any aspect of a Munchausen accusation. Even entertaining a doubt that an accused man might be innocent would be considered backlash. It would be "pro-abuse."

Through a selective campaign similar to what they have done with domestic violence, feminists would succeed in convincing the public that virtually all the victims are female. Munchausen by Proxy would become part of the War on Women.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Sooner or later, an Andrea Dworkin type would state that Munchausen by Proxy is the basic way that fathers control their children. And eventually feminists would start saying that all men are potential Munchausen abusers. Just as some feminists now say that all marriages are a form of rape, some of them would say that all fatherhood is a form of Munchausen abuse.

Women's Studies programs would teach courses in Munchausen by Proxy as a metaphor for the patriarchy.

Lastly, they would develop a cadre of guilt-ridden men who are ashamed to be male because of the terrible things done by male Munchausen patients. These men would have to feel intense guilt and responsibility toward any offense committed by any Munchausen man.

But Munchausen by Proxy is mostly a female disease. So forget any efforts to try to generalize any Munchausen abuses to all women. That would be sexism -- if it's done to women.

That still leaves the question of why Munchausen by Proxy is seen as a psychiatric condition just because it occurs primarily in women. Behavior that would be seen as the workings of a criminal mind in men is seen as the workings of a sick mind in women.

But take Kathy Bush. She is facing criminal abuse charges. But the fact that her actions fall into a category classified as a "psychiatric illness," there's always the chance she'll get a mild sentence, or be sentenced to psychiatric care, or even acquitted.

So which is she: criminal, or sick victim? It might be worth noting all of her actions. While saying she was swamped with her child's medical bills, she collected donations from sympathetic people. Prosecutors say she spent a lot of that money on gifts and trips. In fact, she had a swimming pool put in at her home.

If this were a condition present mostly in men, just replace the label "psychiatric patient" with "con artist."⁴¹

JUNE 1996

WELCOME, READERS to a special "War On Women" edition of *MANifesto*. Feminists say that anyone who questions their outlook

is conducting a "War On Women." Anyone who questions their accusations is "revictimizing the victim." Questioning the accuser is such an offense that one woman's solution was to break the investigator's foot. (See below.)

In this edition of *MANifesto*, we question feminist claims all over the place. Apparently that means we're conducting a "War on Women," so let's get busy.⁴²

Why Would She Lie? (Oops, She Did!)

Maybe you've heard the feminist slogan from the Clarence Thomas hearings: "Why would she lie?"

This simple slogan implies that if you can't immediately find a reason that a woman is lying when she makes an accusation, then she must be telling the truth.

But in Annapolis, Maryland, a female midshipperson who accused a high-ranking midshipman of sexual assault has been kicked out of the Naval Academy. The reason: lying.

Midshipman 1st Class Naomi Jackson was caught lying about why she missed an academy dinner.

Why would she lie? Oops, she did!

In an unrelated incident: Investigators found no evidence to support sexual harassment accusations made by four women at the Navy's Air Test and Evaluation Squadron 9 at Point Mugu, Calif. But one of the women was so enraged at being reinterviewed about her accusations that she broke the investigator's foot.

The Navy is taking the incident so seriously that the woman might actually be charged.

Which brings up the question: is violence the basic way that women try to settle disputes and control people?⁴³

The Caller from Libelville: You're on the Air

Larry King might want to interview his next wife as to why she was telling lies about a former boyfriend.

King, the CNN talk show host and interviewer, is set to marry Cyndy Truhan, who once was married to baseball player Steve Garvey.

Truhan has just pleaded guilty to lying to police that she was being stalked by a former boyfriend. She admits sending weird notes

to herself and defacing her door with an "X." Her most outlandish (and obviously false) claim was that an attacker had bitten off her ear.

Truhan was charged with six counts of lying to police. But four charges were dropped. She pleaded guilty to the remaining two, and received a traditional "woman's sentence" -- therapy, and unsupervised probation.

It is a remarkably light sentence, considering the damage that could have been done. Accusations of the sort she made could have destroyed a man's reputation, sent him to prison, gotten him fired, or perhaps made him a target for vigilante violence by hot-heads bent on protecting the womenfolk.

Feminists have a slogan: "Why would she lie?" Maybe she would lie because, if she succeeds, she can destroy a man she hates -- but if she's caught, she received a "punishment" so light it's hardly noticeable.

The Washington Post reported the incident in a gossip column in its Lifestyle section (June 5). When women receive "unwanted sexual advances," it is serious news to the Post, often getting front-page coverage. When a man receives "unwanted character assassination," the Post runs it alongside idle gossip and humorous tidbits. As for why it's in the Lifestyle section -- is using the Violence Against Women Act to smear innocent men now considered a lifestyle choice?⁴⁴

Believe the Children

Two years ago, the terror descended on Wenatchee, Washington.

It began when police officer Robert Perez launched an investigation into a supposed "child sex ring" in the area. There were wild accusations of gangs of black-clad adults raping and molesting children in church basements -- swapping their children for sex and lining up to have sex with them.

Before the panic was over, 28 people were charged, 14 pleaded guilty, and five were convicted. "One disturbing aspect of the case has been that virtually everyone who could afford to retain a private attorney was acquitted or had his or her charges dismissed, while most of those who relied on public defenders received prison sentences," The Washington Post reports.

And now, one of the central witnesses in the case has recanted. She is a 13-year-old girl who now says she was never molested. She says she was coerced into making the accusations by her foster-father -- Officer Robert Perez.

The girl, identified in court papers as M.E., says Perez pressured her and once bruised her during an altercation shortly before she testified at one trial. "I had to make it all up," she said in another taped interview. "Bob Perez was there, and he pressured me to say it." She said that Perez "got some information and told us to use our own words ... First I said it didn't happen, and ... then he forced me to make up a lie."

Investigators also used the controversial "recovered memory therapy" to coax testimony from the children. "Recovered memory therapy" is a highly flawed technique that is coming under increasing skepticism. It is used by people who "recover" memories of being abducted by flying saucers, or memories of their previous lives, and even memories of their future lives. Some experts say it merely creates and reinforces false memories.

But "recovered memory therapy" continues to be supported by leading feminists. They seem to like its ability to call forth an unending supply of abuse stories.

Feminists also support the "Believe the Children" movement, which stresses that molested children will not talk about it, and must be forced to open up through a barrage of coercive techniques. "Believe the Children" advocates have an unusual trait -- they never believe the children until the children give the answers they want to hear. As M.E. put it: "The first time Bob Perez and (a Child Protective Services social worker) came to talk to me, I said nothing happened. He said, 'I know you're lying.'" From there, the pressure increased.

Some of their tactics seem blatantly coercive. One girl was sent to a mental institution in Idaho for recovered memory therapy and brought back and made to sign a statement alleging abuse. After an experience like that, she probably was willing to sign anything.

What is happening in Wenatchee is not new. The nation has been through this before, with the Satanic panics -- fears that

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

there were secretive cult conspiracies dedicated to molesting and brainwashing children in daycare centers. Today, investigators have learned to drop the references to Satan worship. Now the preferred term is "child sex ring" rather than "Satanic ritual abuse."

But the techniques used in Wenatchee and in the Satanic panics are pretty much the same -- and so are the problems. They involve zealous child-care workers who won't take no for an answer -- who browbeat, humiliate and even threaten the children until the children "recover" the desired memory of abuse. They are the same leading and coercive techniques that led to the fiasco at the McMartin Preschool. Authorities have merely learned to drop the Satanic trappings in a bid for credibility.

The Satanic panics and the "child sex ring" witch hunts have deep roots in feminist conspiracy theories that rape and sexual abuse are epidemic, ritualized and institutionalized. As far as we know, Gloria Steinem, Ms. Magazine and other leading feminist lights continue their support for the Satanic panics and "recovered memory therapy" -- or at least have not withdrawn their vigorous support. How many innocent lives -- men and women -- will have to be destroyed before they admit they are wrong?⁴⁵

Who is the Abuser?

A father from Plattsburgh, New York, has won \$125,000 in compensatory damages after a jury found that investigators from the Clinton County child protective system smeared him and prosecuted him wrongly.

A U.S. District Court jury in Albany, N.Y., decided unanimously in favor of the man, Reverend Frank Fowler Jr.

County child protective service workers investigated after hearing that Fowler had slapped his 11-year-old son across the face in March of 1993. Fowler says that case-worker Jo Robinson threatened to skew the investigation when he wouldn't let her talk to his parishioners.

The record indicates that she did just that.

Robinson initially reported that the boy had no physical injuries. Several weeks later, she changed her story and claimed that she saw a big bruise on the boy's face. However,

several other witnesses said the boy had no bruises.

But Fowler was about to learn what happens to people who displease the bureaucracy.

He was arrested and prosecuted. The "child protection" workers then used their arbitrary authority to place his name placed on a registry of child abusers. Fowler said the scandal caused him to be blacklisted in Plattsburgh and forced him to move to Syracuse.

Fowler agreed not to pursue punitive damages, contingent on them taking his name off the state Department of Social Services' registry of child abusers.

The Associated Press reports that "The jury found that Robinson and a co-worker, Patricia Layo, caused Fowler to be falsely arrested for assault and that the pair maliciously prosecuted him."

"The jury also determined that supervisor Stephanie Clark "grossly disregarded" her duty to oversee the pair and that the agency maintained an atmosphere in which social workers were allowed to abuse their power."

"Why would she lie?" the feminists ask. And why would all three of them lie? Well, add "arrogant abuse of power" to the list.

(This story is not getting much attention. Chances are you heard about it in MANifesto first. And that's odd. When women receive "unwanted sexual advances," it's front-page, prime-time news. When a man's reputation is destroyed by malicious false accusations coming from a government agency, it's just a local story.)⁴⁶

A Call to Protect Women

It was a nightmarish scene, one that all too many women are familiar with. A woman was alone in an elevator. A young man got on. He lunged at her. She screamed.

What actually happened in that elevator on a pleasant day in May is in dispute. The man said he tripped and bumped the woman, and then grabbed her when she started to fall.

Not everyone believes his version. And, as feminists say, "Why would she lie?"

And there were people who won't tolerate violence against women. Not everyone is going to sit on the sidelines while the war on women rages. Not everyone is going to tolerate the epidemic of violence against

innocent women who are afraid to walk the streets or even ride the elevators.

Women's advocates might be glad to know that this incident was not buried in the back sections of the papers. In fact, it made the front page. There was a stirring call to arms, a resounding cry of "no more."

The activists gathered to take back the night -- with guns and torches. The woman was white, the young man was black. It was in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1921, and the race riot that followed wiped out the prosperous black business district known as Greenwood. Scores of people, perhaps even hundreds, were killed. Greenwood looked like a war zone. More than 1,000 black-owned businesses and homes were burned to the ground. The National Guard had to be called in.*

And in the aftermath of this horrible tragedy, the woman declined to press charges against the man. Today, most people in Tulsa they believe the young man was telling the truth. But it's difficult to sort out the truth when emotions run out of control and the front pages are screaming with scary headlines about violence against women. That's how it was in Tulsa. That's how it is in our nation today.

Emotions are at a fever pitch again, as partisan groups pump up the rhetoric and whip up their followers with misleading statistics and broad stereotypes. The violent reactions today are not as blatant and concentrated as the riot in Tulsa. It's a quiet riot, spread out across the country, involving a person's life ruined here, a person's life ended there -- a teen named Eddie Polec beaten to death in Philadelphia, a young man named John Baumgardner gunned down in Fairfax, Virginia, and the countless others who have been fired, bankrupted, disgraced, ostracized, beaten or maimed because of inaccurate accusations.

In the aftermath of the horrible riot, Tulsa learned tolerance. Whites learned that they shouldn't judge other people too quickly.

There are some feminists who, hopefully, will learn the same lesson about men.⁴⁷

The Next Susan Smith

* ("The Fire That Seared Into Tulsa's Memory: In the Ruins of a Riot, A City Learned Tolerance," *the Washington Post*, May 30, 1996, page A1.)

A woman in Rowlett, Texas, told police that a man broke into her house and stabbed her two little boys to death, and then stabbed her in the arm.

The unspeakable cads on the police force apparently did not know about the feminist dictum that if you question the victim, you only re-traumatize her. They took part in the "War on Women" by questioning her story. And it doesn't check out.

The woman, Darlie Routier, told police she was stabbed while in the living room. The blood evidence indicates she was stabbed in the kitchen. The one set of bloody footprints found in the home belonged to Routier herself. Routier claimed that the intruder cut through a window screen to get into the house. But in the kitchen, investigators found a knife with metal fragments that matched the cut window screen. Routier has been jailed, accused of killing her own sons.

The "War on Women" is an interesting phrase. Feminist slap that label on efforts to reform welfare, or on criticism of feminism, or men who actually want to get the jobs and promotions they deserve. But when women kill their children, smoke crack while pregnant, throw newborns into dumpsters, or leave starving children in excrement-caked apartments while they go out and party, feminists do not call it a "War on Children." Instead, they look for ways in which to call the women "victims."

So Darlie Routier might well become the next Susan Smith. Look for feminist (and the news media) to dig into Routier's past, trying to find "the man who made her do it." This attitude betrays a central sexist stereotype: crime is a male thing -- if a woman commits crime, there must be a man who pushed her to the brink. (It would be interesting to see the reaction if the news media looked into the past of male criminals and started pinning the blame on abusive women.)

Blaming it all on men is the natural thing for some people to do. Susan Smith said a black man abducted her two sons, and many people accepted that story and believed her. But they were stunned when it turned out she had killed the boys herself.

Then there was a national outcry that Smith, a white woman, had tried to pin the crime on a black man. It created a firestorm

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

of criticism that her motives smacked of bigotry.

Routier is white and said that a white man killed her boys. Now there is no national outrage. She didn't smear black people. She just merely smeared all men.⁴⁸

First Amendment? In a Pig's Eye!

Russell Sysack of Cleveland, Ohio, likes to put his opinions up on a billboard. He makes social or political comments on a 5-by-20-foot color billboard in front of his sign shop.

But now a lawyer is going after his latest billboard. It makes fun of women who filed a \$25 million lawsuit saying there were peepholes in the restrooms of a local shopping center. The sign portrays the women as pigs.

Here's the lawyer's argument for banning the billboard:

Attorney Michael Shafran said, "I think that the owner of this property and business has gone beyond the scope of free speech by referring to the women as pigs."⁴⁹

Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries

Michael D. Chase of Knoxville, Tennessee, is on trial in the death of his 18-month-old son, Mikey. The boy died of heat stroke after sitting in a locked car for three hours on a hot August day.

Michael Chase says he did not know his son was in the back seat when he drove to a business meeting. And his wife, Donna, says she was the one who strapped the boy into the back seat. She isn't sure she told her husband that the boy was in the car, which has dark-tinted windows.

Donna Chase is not charged with anything at all.

But Michael Chase faces up to five years in prison if convicted of criminally negligent homicide.

There is something odd about the way prosecutors are handling the case, which is being tried in Georgetown, Delaware. Donna Chase insisted that she would not testify unless she was granted immunity from prosecution. So prosecutors gave it to her.

But why would she need immunity? People who request it usually fear that they might face charges without it. If Donna Chase demanded immunity, wouldn't it

indicate she had something to hide? Wouldn't prosecutors think about charging her? Why give immunity to the person who apparently has something to hide -- in order to go after a man who says he is innocent?

Could it be that prosecutors made up their minds that the man automatically has to be the guilty party, and will jump through any hoops to maintain that view?

And in another court case of interest, former church choir singer Lisa Whedbee is headed for a year in a Knox County, Tennessee, detention facility, followed by three years' probation. That's really not a very long sentence. Her crime? Merely trying to have her husband killed.

Whedbee made some claims about being abused by her husband. But, as it turned out, she had another reason for wanting him dead: a \$1 million life insurance policy on him, which she stood to collect.

Isn't it remarkable how many "abusive husbands" are kind enough to have large insurance policies made out to their wives? Or an attractive estate that she plans to inherit?

Indeed, having a life insurance policy seems to be one of the "warning signs" that a man will be labeled an abuser -- after he's attacked. Perhaps we ought to round up all the men who have their lives insured and send them to therapy, because there's such a strong correlation between having money that a wife can inherit and being accused of abuse once she tries to bump him off.

Lisa Whedbee talked a lovesick admirer into trying to kill her husband, Rob Whedbee, as he was sleeping. But Rob Whedbee survived the attack with minor injuries. He divorced her. Smart move.

Michael Frazier, the man Lisa Whedbee conned into doing her dirty work, was the choir director at the church where they met. Frazier also was a reporter who profiled her in an award-winning 1993 Mother's Day story -- painting her as a heroic mom trying to raise a handicapped child.

As her henchman, he got a sentence four times longer than that of Lisa Whedbee, the mastermind and instigator of the plot.

Michael Frazier still loves her. But now that his potential usefulness to her is over with, she doesn't return his love. In fact, she

just got married -- to a different man who apparently doesn't believe or doesn't mind that she tried to have one husband killed.

Michael Frazier serves as an example to all those Sir Galahads out there who come blindly running to protect frail womanhood: you might think you're going to get laid, but you end up getting screwed.⁵⁰

Just in Time for Father's Day: Dad Bashing

Just in time for Father's Day, The Washington Post allowed a reporter to take a story about an Internet project and shape it into an anti-dad screed titled "Downtrodden Youth Dream of City Without Men."

The story ostensibly was about an Internet project called "Mirage: An Imaginary City," which would let poor children talk about the dream city they would like to live in.

But to Post reporter Molly Moore, it was a chance to bash dads with stark, blatant stereotypes and hostility that the Post would never have permitted had the targets been religious or ethnic groups.

Moore reports some highly suspect comments supposedly coming uncoached from the children. It begins: "For 13-year-old Evelyn Mansilla, the perfect city would be built deep in a verdant jungle. No men would be allowed, and women could give birth only through artificial insemination. Without men, says Evelyn, the city would have no crime, no need for police, no wife beatings, no child abuse."

Moore also quotes an American photographer, Nancy McGirr, who worked with the girls as they came up with "the rules of 'The Women's Paradise'" which include: "No men can enter the city. ... The only form of reproduction is by artificial means ... All boys must leave the city once they reach age 16. ... There will be no soldiers or police because they won't be necessary because there will be no violence." There are plenty of other quotes that fathers are violent drunkards. "The one who don't have fathers are often better off than those who do. ... The fathers drink most of the time, they abuse the kids ..." "If the men stayed with their families, they wouldn't work anyway ..."

We won't belabor the fact that the Post would never run a story saying that children dream of a city free of the scourge of one ethnic group or another whose people commit all the crime and violence and then sit around lazily drinking all day.

But we'd like to remind folks that the Post is the paper that gave us Janet Cooke, the woman who won a Pulitzer Prize with a series about a young heroin addict -- who turned out to be the fictitious product of Cooke's own mind.

Has someone put another fast one over on the Post?

Consider:

The worst of the man-bashing quotes come from distant, non-English-speaking places such as Guatemalan slums, making it difficult to pick up a phone and double-check the sources. When the story quotes sources in London, for instance, the man-bashing disappears.

The Guatemalan girls are described as ranging from 10 to 13 in age. These impoverished, uneducated girls are coming up with some remarkably scientific terms -- artificial insemination -- and applying them to a knowledge of biology that is quite impressive for pre-pubescent girls.

And there are slants apparent within the story itself. For example, Moore writes: "Even the boys in the project have few kind words for their dads. Adeldo Ordonez, 13, photographed his teary-eyed baby brother ... He captioned the picture, 'My brother crying because my parents are fighting.'" So Moore took an incident of *both parents* fighting, and then presented it as if the boy had few kind words for his *dad*.

Altogether, the girls display a mindset that seems awfully close to some contemporary, urban, white-collar feminist thought, including the hostility toward sex and the utopian ideal of getting rid of men. Their schemes are remarkably reminiscent of novels such as "The Gate to Women's Country" by Sheri S. Tepper (wise women live apart from men after the nuclear holocaust, practicing eugenics and thinking up final solutions to the male question), or Charlotte Perkins Gilman's utopian novel "Herland" about an all-female society, or any of the other feminist plays and stories that treat men with a "banish or vanish" theme.

* (June 9, 1996, page A22.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Are these novels circulating among little girls of the Guatemalan slums? Or is it a case of American feminists circulating among the little girls of the Guatemalan slums?

It would be interesting to find out if Moore or McGirr have read any of these works. Perhaps that would help answer the question: are these ideas really springing fully formed from pre-pubescent girls in the ghetto? Or was there a bit of activist journalism at work?

And if this is not enough father-bashing for you, it certainly wasn't enough father-bashing for the Fox network. On June 16 it aired "Bad Dads," a documentary about what failures and disasters fathers are. It was filmed behind bars -- well, isn't that how we've come to think of fathers these days? It featured criminals who were fathers and yet estranged from their children. Fox seems to think that criminals are the perfect metaphor for fathers.

Fox justifies the dad-bashing by saying there is a crisis in fatherhood today.

But today, the problem of crack-addicted babies is still going strong, though it's slipped off the front pages. There still are women who throw their infants from bridges or dump them in garbage cans, or abuse, desert, starve, or kill their children. But Fox certainly didn't present a "Bad Moms" special just before Mother's Day.

That seems to indicate two things:

- Though some mothers are quite profane, motherhood itself remains sacred.
- That men are being held to higher levels of responsibility. The "Bad Dads" special brought the message that fathers should clean up their act. A lack of a "Bad Moms" counterpart indicates that that sentiment is not being applied to women.⁵¹

Senator Biden's Level Playing Field

Democratic Senator Joseph Biden of Delaware has been a great friend of feminists. He was a major force in getting the "Violence Against Women Act" passed. He supports feminist causes and hobnobs with feminist leaders. He even had hair plugs, so that he could be more of a friend to women.

Biden supports affirmative action and other social engineering to "level the playing field" for women and make everything nice

and fair. So Joe Biden is a real fair-minded guy, right?

If you want to find out just how fair he is, ask the thousands of people who just tried to compete for a job opening against Joseph R. "Beau" Biden III, the senator's son.

About 4,000 people applied for entry-level positions last year at the Justice Department. These positions are prestige jobs for young lawyers -- hotly sought out as a ticket to power and inside contacts. Out of those 4,000 applicants, only 163 were hired. And one of them was the senator's son.

Pop and Junior both say that the younger Biden was qualified for the position. (Such whiny white males -- since when did being qualified for a job mean that you should get it?) But if the younger Biden is "qualified," it's worth noting that when got his law degree in 1994 from Syracuse University, he had a grade point average of 2.69 -- not even good enough to put him in the top 25 percent of his class.

So if he can't make the top 25 percent of one graduating class, how did he suddenly shoot to the top 4 percent of 4,000 job applicants from across the nation?

Surely it was just a coincidence? What kind of strings could Biden possibly have pulled? Well, let's see. Senator Biden is on the Senate Judiciary Committee. In fact, he used to be its chairman. And the Judiciary Committee oversees the Justice Department, where the senator's son just got that prestigious job.

And one of the projects the younger Biden will be working on is the Violence Against Women Act -- one of Senator Biden's sacred cows.

But this sort of thing is not a habit with Senator Biden, is it?

Well, let's take a look at the Government Printing Office. The chief lobbyist for the GPO, getting a nice \$78,000 a year paycheck, is a man named Francis W. "Frank" Biden. He's the senator's younger brother.

We are proud of Senator Biden for showing us how liberal ethics are put into action - "do as I say, not as I do." Senator Biden had demanded that we "level the playing field." Everyone out there who feels that affirmative action is unfair will just have to shut up about it and take their lumps.

Meanwhile, there is some affirmative action in getting people named Biden -- a woefully underrepresented minority -- onto Capitol Hill.

Senator Biden indeed levels the playing field.

Just think of all those other applicants who get leveled when someone named "Biden" came along.⁵²

Humor:

Plane Crash Hits Women Hardest

Headline: Plane Crash Hits Women Hardest, POW study finds

Byline: The Per Broadcasting System

The crash of the ValuJet flight in the Florida Everglades hit women hardest, says a new study just released by the Propaganda Organization for Women (POW).

POW President Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname said there were both men and women aboard the ValuJet flight when it crashed. "But in every situation, women are hardest hit. Obviously that rule applies to plane crashes as well."

"In virtually every income and social level, women are at a disadvantage compared to men," Hyphenated-Lastname said. "Naturally, this also applies to death. Ever since childhood, boys were encouraged to play war games, or cops and robbers and other games in which the players pretend to be shot and killed. Therefore, boys grow up with valuable training and experience in dying that puts women at a disadvantage. Society imposes this limit on girls and women. Like the sneaker commercial says about girls: 'If you want to empower me, teach me how to die.'"

Hyphenated-Lastname explained other ways in which her organization reached its findings: "We know that violence against women is always wrong. And the flip-side of that coin is that violence against men is sometimes great. Now, this was a very violent plane crash. So obviously all the violence against women was wrong, but some of the violence against the men was justified or tolerable. To these men we say, 'stop whining.'"

"We know that the men on the plane just sat there while this terrible violence hap-

pened to women. How is it, in our day and age, that these men could just sit by and do nothing while women died? Because of their lack of action, those men are partly to blame for the deaths of those women -- as are men everywhere."

"It seems likely that some of the men on that plane were not willing to give up their lives. This is part of the backlash against women. We see the same thing when men do not want to be fired, demoted, passed over for promotion or discriminated against in order to assure equality. These men do not want to give up their privileges. We assume that some men on that plane did not want to give up the privilege of life, either. But obviously, if they died, then a woman might get their jobs. They might claim that they 'only want to go on living.' The real reason is they just want to hold women back."

"However, it is a matter of controversy as to whether any men on the plane actually died," Hyphenated-Lastname said. "We know that death is the ultimate form of victimhood, and we also know that only women are victims. Therefore it's debatable whether any of the men on the plane actually died, or whether they merely underwent a radical deconstruction of their Eurocentric consciousness."

"We studied the plane crash using the same methods we employ to study and identify domestic violence, discrimination and sexism," Hyphenated-Lastname said. "All those studies show that only women are victims. So obviously there were no male victims on the plane that crashed."

"Our study defined death thusly: It's death if it happens to women, and it's not death if it happens to men. This is, after all, the same way we define discrimination and sexism."⁵³

Play Exciting New Game: Moral High Ground

"Race to the Moral Highground" is an exciting new board game that pits the good people (known as Feminists) against the rest of the oppressive, immoral, barbaric world (known as men.)

The board: The game is played on a "level playing field," which consists of throwing the men down a well in leg irons so the Feminists will have an equal chance. The path is circular and closed off to the outside

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

world, to mirror the types of logic used in Women's Studies courses.

How it's played: Feminists advance to the moral high ground by saying and doing things that would be considered terribly sexist and bigoted coming from men.

Rolling the dice: Feminists get to use the same scientific methodology they use in their studies of wages, violence, etc. In other words, they get to keep rolling the dice until they get the results they want.

The Squares: Players roll the dice and land on squares that contain benefits for Feminists and penalties for men (who are also known as Backlashers.)

- I Care Only About My Own Group Square. If you're the Feminist, land on this square and declare that you're interested only in the rights, health, safety and comfort of women. This will advance you three spaces toward the moral high ground. If you're the Backlasher, declare that you're interested only in the rights, health, safety and comfort of men. Get penalized three squares as a sexist.
- Past Injustices Square. Past injustices happened only to women. Even wealthy Ivy League Feminists who land on this square get a special promotion to make up for past injustices. Advance three squares toward the moral high ground. Backlashers have to give the Feminist their next turn, in order to make up for past injustices.
- The Commit Sexual Harassment Square. On this square, only men are penalized. How do you like my Fabio calendar, stud muffin?(However, Democratic presidents get to put off any punishment until the game is over.)
- Domestic Violence Square. If you're name is Warren Moon, you will be arrested for hurting your wife's knee by ramming it with your groin.
- Stereotype Square. Feminist landing here can declare that all men are potential rapists, all men are wealthy and privileged, that men commit all the crime and spouse abuse. Then advance three squares for "educating the public" and "serving as the conscience of society." Backlashers who make any statement that starts with "all women are ..." must go directly to the Diversity Committee. Do not pass the First Amendment. Do not collect freedom of speech. (But take heart. The Diversity Commit-

tee may decide that you're entitled to free speech -- if they like the speech.)

- Affirmative Action Square. Everyone gets penalized if they refer to Affirmative Action as "preferences," "quotas" or "discrimination." Remember, it's discrimination only if it happens to women.
- Victimhood Square. If you're a woman who kills a man, you're a victim. Advance two squares. If you're a man who kills a woman, you're a man who kills a woman. Any questions?
- Male Feminist Square. Advance one square if you can read statements like "all men are potential rapists who commit all the crime and all the spouse abuse" and still claim that you've never seen any examples of male-bashing.
- VMI Square. If you're a man who belongs to any organization that has only male members, get penalized for belonging to a sexist good ol' boys club. If you're a woman, you get to lead a delegation from the 80-plus women-only colleges in the United States as they protest at The Virginia Military Institute. Advance toward the moral high ground.
- Recovered Memory Square. Recover "repressed memories" of any damn thing you want! If you think you were abused, then you were abused! Congratulations: you now are a victim with no obligation to forgive anyone for any offense, no matter how specious. Advance three squares toward the moral high ground.
- Believe The Children Square. Social workers will browbeat and threaten the kids until they say Satan force-fed them mustard-covered 'Smores. Just keep rolling the dice until you come up with the accusation you want.

Ending the Game: You can actually repeat this procedure forever. God knows they're doing it now.⁵⁴

JULY 1996

WELCOME READERS, to our atonement for last issue's "War On Women" theme. In that issue we discussed all those things that feminists label a "War On Women" -- das-tardly things such as disagreeing with a feminist. To make up for it, we present a special "Protecting the Womenfolk" issue. (If you know of any feminist who perceives

33

criticism to be a "verbal battering," please protect the poor dear by making sure she does not read this issue -- or anything else that might challenge her assumptions.)

More Mugu To-Do

In the last issue of MANifesto, we told you about the sexual harassment accusations being made by four women at the Navy's Air Test and Evaluation Squadron 9 at Point Mugu, Calif. Investigators found no evidence to back up the accusations. But one of the women was so enraged at being questioned on her accusations that she broke the investigator's foot.

Now the latest to-do at Mugu: When being questioned on her story, another one of the accusers began yelling, then raised her fist at the investigator and had to be restrained. The woman, Debbie Clark, 22, has been sent to the brig for 30 days for assault.

All of the accused men have been cleared. However, three of the four accusers have been cited for rule infractions. The fourth woman has been dismissed from service because of a personality disorder.

Some feminists seem to think that women are entitled to greater safety protection than men, that women should be shielded from a variety of indignities that men routinely endure -- and that due process and standards of proof should be lowered to more easily convict men solely on a woman's accusation. When a woman makes an accusation, she should be automatically believed, so they say.

So, tongue in cheek and shoe on the other foot, we have to ask:

Are violence and threats the tools that feminists use when they feel their matriarchal privileges are threatened?

Just asking.⁵⁵

Protecting the Womenfolk, Part I

Adrian Pilkington was 20 years old when he was stabbed and tossed off a bridge in Frederick County, Maryland, on June 18.

Four teenagers are accused of killing him, says State's Attorney Scott Rolle.

The motive, says Rolle: the teens believed Pilkington had shown disrespect toward one of their female friends.⁵⁶

Protecting the Womenfolk, Part II

Paul "P.J." Jefferson, 19, was beaten to death by a mob of teens who gathered at his house June 27 in Waldorf, Maryland. Motive: The attackers were angry because they believed P.J.'s brother had called one of their female friends a "heifer" and accused her of taking \$40.⁵⁷

Protecting the Womenfolk, Part III

Captain Ernie Blanchard was the chief spokesman for the Coast Guard, a dedicated serviceman who inspired others and won glowing praise and admiration.

As a speaker, he had a gift for firing up an audience or a classroom. But Ernie Blanchard's life was destroyed because of a speech he gave in January of 1995 to Coast Guard Academy cadets in New London, Connecticut.

In it, he told suggestive jokes to a room of both men and women. One example: He met a sailor who had given his fiancée a diamond brooch with several naval flag signals surrounding it. She thought that the flags meant "I love you." but he took a closer look and realized they meant "permission granted to lay alongside."

Some in the audience took offense.

When Blanchard was told of this, he immediately wrote a letter of apology that was read to the entire company. This was an unusual step: a superior officer and chief spokesman for the entire Coast Guard, humbling himself before cadets. But Blanchard listened to the criticism and did his best to make amends and educate others in how his behavior had been unacceptable.

For some people, it still was not enough.

Though Blanchard had apologized, his critics pushed for more. They got the academy superintendent involved, and the admiral "instructed" Blanchard personally about the matter. And Blanchard's jokes were revived again and used in classes to give the cadets further instruction in sensitivity.

It still was not enough.

An 800-page report on the incident (with unnamed, unidentified women hurling unanswered invective at Blanchard) reveals what some of them were thinking. One said the Coast Guard should "make an example out of Blanchard. Book 'im." One woman who was not even at the dinner wrote: "No one

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

should come in from outside the academy and spread such a message of hate."

But who was spreading hate? Was it Blanchard, by telling some ill-advised jokes and then apologizing? Or his attackers? Their tactics became increasingly sinister. Soon they were spreading false rumors that Blanchard told racist jokes at the dinner. Black people who were there -- and who would have remembered -- recalled no such jokes. But Blanchard's critics were not going to let truth get in the way.

And it still was not enough.

Commander Kathleen Donohoe, the Coast Guard's gender policy adviser, visited the academy. She stayed up until 4 a.m. talking with female cadets who had not been at the dinner, yet were still outraged. Donohoe took the horror stories back to the bureaucracy in Washington. The matter was urgent, because female cadets were threatening to take the story to the local media, which had a reputation for being hostile toward the academy. They would probably love a story like this -- another Tailhook scandal.

A rear admiral ordered an investigation. Blanchard was read his Miranda rights.

His critics were getting what they wanted.

They were out for blood.

They got it.

Twelve days after Ernie Blanchard was read his rights, he put a revolver in his mouth and pulled the trigger. "Blanchard, 46, career military man, husband and father of a teenage son and daughter, a man with no history of emotional problems, took his life certain that he was about to be sacrificed by a Coast Guard determined to show it could never produce a Tailhook."* "This is about a death by political correctness," the Post says. "Whether it was suicide by political correctness or homicide by political correctness depends on your point of view."

But what seems certain to us that the people going after Ernie Blanchard wanted to destroy him, in one way or another. To protect women from dirty jokes, they would willingly destroy a man's career. One way or another, they would destroy his life.

His life was less important to them than the sensitivities of women who are supposed to be able to serve and protect our nation in

the face of more hostile actions than a few off-color jokes.

And after Blanchard's death, the investigating officer ruled that by telling jokes to a roomful of people, Blanchard had committed willful sexual harassment.

The decision was overturned. Too late to save Blanchard.

We have to question a movement that would be outraged over a man making sexual jokes, yet have no trouble with making false accusations of racism. We have to question a procedure that sets men up for minor offenses and allows people to take out on him all their past political anger or private disappointments.

Fourteen months after Blanchard's suicide, there was another death in the ranks. Navy Admiral Jeremy M. "Mike" Boorda, chief of naval operations, killed himself due to tremendous pressures on the Navy because of recent scandals, including Tailhook. The news media had loved Tailhook. It had sex in it. It featured sobbing women in need of protection, and reporters eager to take down any claim they made. It was made-for-TV-movie fodder. It was a great scandal. And even men who were never accused of wrongdoing have had their careers destroyed simply because they were there at Tailhook. (See next item.) These men have been cleared by the military justice system, yet are still condemned in the court of political expediency.

Their innocence is not enough. There is no price too high to pay for protecting the womenfolk.⁵⁸

Protecting the Womenfolk, Part IV

Cmdr. Robert E. Stumpf, a Navy pilot, has decided to retire and give up on fighting trumped-up charges related to the Tailhook scandal.

Stumpf is a gifted pilot who once led the elite Blue Angels flying team. But his career was shot down because he was at the 1991 Tailhook Association convention in Las Vegas.

Stumpf's "crime" was being in a hotel suite where a strip-tease act was performed. Testimony says that after Stumpf left the room, a stripper performed oral sex on an aviator.

* (The Washington Post, July 7, 1996, page F1.)

Stumpf and 132 other men were put on a secret list containing rumors or unproven accusations of misconduct at Tailhook. This process is known as "Tailhook certification."

Whenever a soldier with "Tailhook certification" is recommended for promotion, the Senate Armed Forces Committee has been automatically rejecting it. It doesn't matter if the men were cleared. Our public servants don't want to do anything that could get them accused of being "soft on Tailhook."

The Senate actually approved Stumpf's promotion once, then put on the political pressure to kill it after realizing they had forgotten about his "Tailhook certification."

Stumpf, a highly qualified soldier who would risk his life to defend his country, is leaving the service of a country that would not defend him.

His case is an ironic contrast to that of Kara Hultgreen, who became a fighter pilot amid a lot of political pressure to put women in military planes. Hultgreen crashed and died while attempting to land on an aircraft carrier. The brass tried to blame mechanical problems, but confidential reports leaked to the Internet and the news media showed that the cause was pilot error. The political pressures that put her in the cockpit are also keeping a qualified male out.

There is something seriously wrong when the military tries to shield a woman's reputation from the consequences of her own actions while ruining a man's reputation based on the actions of others.

The main role of the military is to protect the womenfolk -- and all the rest of us, as well. If soldiers were in a position to save your family, what would matter most to you -- whether the soldiers are well-trained and capable, or whether they had once been in a hotel room with a stripper?⁵⁹

Protecting the Womenfolk, Part V: My Own Rush to Judgment

The item arrived in my e-mail. I set it aside with the rest of the personal correspondence and spams until I was offline. Then, with a cup of coffee in hand, I began reading a horror story.

Beginning with the innocuous title of "Read this account of a walk I took," it described a man who took a walk near secluded woods, encountered a young woman, and

savagely attacked her. The sadistic, dehumanizing attack was described in pornographic detail: anal rape, rape with a splintering stick, savage beatings that excited the narrator sexually.

I read it at first hoping, and then praying, that the story was a joke, that the narration would turn out to be a trick or rhetorical device, and all the time wondering, "Why has this been sent to me?"

But the story wasn't a trick or a rhetorical device. It concludes with the narrator wounding the woman with gunshots and leaving her to die there slowly, in the woods, then walking away quite satisfied.

I felt degraded just for having read it. And I had a lingering sense of guilt, wondering: "What in the world could I have ever said on the Internet that would make him think I wanted to see his sick fantasies? What did I do to encourage him?"

And it left me with a dilemma. I had always advocated free speech on the Internet. But the person who wrote this was sick. I had to ask myself two essential questions:

Was he a genuine danger to women?

By sending me this filth, had he committed an offense grievous enough that his account ought to be sanctioned or terminated?

I checked the return address -- from an American Online account belonging to someone I will refer to as Mr. H. Then I noticed he had not sent it solely to me, but was working off a spamming list.

I wrote down the return address and spiked the story. I didn't want to keep a copy.

Throughout the day, I contemplated what response I would have to make to Mr. H. Regardless of whether I notified his postmaster at AOL, I would have to message him and demand that he never send me anything again. But what tone should I take? Should I try to reason with him that his fantasies are not normal and then tell him that, for his own sake, he should seek treatment? Or should I call him every degenerate name in the book and tell him what I hoped would happen to him?

While thinking it over, I went online to do a little surfing, trying to turn up any other trail of slime he might have left. I found a few innocuous posts he had made, discuss-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

ing his favorite songs from the music group The Police.

But mention of him was cropping up in the net-abuse newsgroups and elsewhere. Many others had received this message. To show just how twisted the sender was, some who received it were in newsgroups for rape or abuse victims.

And other people were pointing out something that should have been obvious. The original message was forged.

It had not originated from America Online. Some hacker had forged a post and made it look like it came from Mr. H's account.

In my emotional, visceral reaction to the story, I hadn't even taken a good look at the header on the story. Anger and revulsion had rolled right over the basic act of looking to see if it was really from his account.

Instead I rushed to judgment that this Mr. H. was indeed guilty, and that something had to be done about him. And I had rushed to this judgment while working on an issue of MANifesto with the theme of the excesses that arise from the rush to "protect the womenfolk." I had absolutely no excuse.

But other people were having harsher reactions.

The story was being used to question First Amendment rights. One poster said, "If free speech say's you can perpusly hurt people, then screw that!"

She added: "I also did not read the whole message I got. As soon as I figured out what the subject matter was, I stopped reading."

But far more sinister are sentiments such as these, posted in the newsgroup alt.religion.christian, in a thread called: "should slaughter these people who send rape stories." It said.

"I dont know much about reading return paths, or tracing sources of this vile trash... but this man should be slaughtered merely for writing this story. I am enraged not just for receiving it in my email, but for a weak government who cant even carry out the biblical command to execute those who openly murder. Court trials and juries are for the innocentlly accused and the not the guilty. If you have ever been raped, do not read this... it is being posted to bring shame to those not severely enforcing the law to rid these mentally ill people. The Bible never excuses mentally ill people from crimes. Mentally ill people should be

treated before they commit crimes, not afterward, when they should be punished as all others."

When I read this, I remember the case of Eddie Polec, a Philadelphia teen beaten to death when someone circulated a false story that Polec had raped a young woman.

I remembered the case of a man named Kaare Sortland, discussed briefly in "The Myth of Repressed Memory," by Dr. Elizabeth Loftus. Sortland and his wife had been accused of child molestation. The accusations were based on so-called "recovered memories," which are increasingly shown to be unreliable, distorted and often false. Kaare and Judy Sortland were cleared of the charges. But one night, someone gunned down Kaare Sortland outside his home.

America Online users can post personal profiles to let other users know more about them. Mr. H., whose account had been forged, had a profile that gave his hometown. If his name is in the phone book, someone could track him down and administer the type of vigilante justice being advocated by some.

Maybe that's exactly what the person who forged Mr. H.'s account was hoping for.

The forger also sent out several other stories -- one of them of the "your mother has sex with dogs" variety. It looks like the forger was trying to get people as furious as possible at Mr. H.

Some people have said that "Read this account of a walk I took" appears to be one of the stories written by the notorious Jake Baker, who stirred national controversy when he transmitted several violent rape fantasies via the Internet. If that is true, then the forger didn't write that story at all, but merely copied it and sent it out.

But why?

If the intent was to stir up a blind fury against Mr. H., then this is precisely the sort of material you would send out.

The material seems designed to tap into that automatic desire to protect the womenfolk -- to shield them from violence, and even from insults and sexual innuendo. It was the type of material that could whip up extreme, vengeful, unthinking rage that results when it seems like the womenfolk are not being protected.

Indeed, the discussions about this post often center on the harm the stories could do to women, or on First Amendment issues. What seems to be overlooked is the possibility that this forgery was designed to bring a great deal of harm to a certain man.

And that raises an interesting legal question: if the forger's story inspired someone to harm Mr. H., would the forger be held accountable?

I have no answers, only lessons from my own emotional rush to judgment against Mr. H., who had posted nothing on the Internet more offensive than his fondness for certain rock music.

As for who the forger could be, I don't know. But perhaps we should look closely at the people who are calling loudest for the harshest punishment against Mr. H. Maybe in their ranks there is someone who knows a bit about where this story came from.⁶⁰

Men are Ringleaders, Women are Drugged

If feminists want women to be given equal credit for the work they do with men, why do they change their minds so suddenly when it comes to violence?

For instance, in a discussion of female violence, a feminist recently asked: "What woman can you present who shows the value system of Charles Manson?"

Well, there's the murderous women in the Charles Manson Family. Had she forgotten about them?

"No ... in fact, I used Charles Manson for that very reason. He was the ring leader. They were the pawns. As I recall, those women were drugged to induce them to commit the acts."

For the record: Manson Family members testified they were stone-cold sober the night of the Sharon Tate killings, because they knew they couldn't be high while carrying out their elaborate plan of murder and misdirection.

But more importantly, note the sexist language used here. The women "were the pawns." And that "those women were drugged."

"Were drugged." Not "those women took drugs." Not "those women were drug users." Instead, they "were drugged" and that means

there had to be someone who was drugging them.

And guess which sex that would have to be?

And if a woman commits violence, there has to be some other explanation than that she committed violence: she must have been abused (the Susan Smith defense) or drugged, or mentally ill. She must have been a victim.

This habit of giving men all the credit runs contrary to feminist rhetoric that women "share equally" in just about every other endeavor. In fact, to give all the credit for this to Charles Manson or men would be deemed absolutely sexist if Manson been the leader of a band dedicated to music, religion or commerce instead of murder.

Suppose Manson had owned a business and several of his high-ranking corporate officers were women. And let's say these women executed many of the company's projects, gladly putting enormous effort into the venture and coming up with innovations of their own. Then along comes a backlasher who says that the women's efforts really don't count because a man was the ringleader and the women would have accomplished nothing without his direction. If someone said that to a feminist, she'd be madder'n a wet hen.

Or take the Persian Gulf war or the Panama invasion. In each case you had male "ringleaders" and female troops obeying their orders. But feminists (and the news media) keep telling us that women did an "equal share" in Iraq and Panama.

So some feminists want to have it both ways. They want women given full credit for any positive actions they perform. But if women do something wrong, they want the a male "ringleader" to get the credit.

Views like these affect how our justice system works.

In Winnemucca, Nevada, a girl told her boyfriend to kill their newborn son. They were equally culpable in wanting the child dead. And the young man, Juan Lopez, was doing what the young woman, Dale Aaron Guilbert, asked him to do.

But note the differences in their plea agreements.

He pleaded guilty to second-degree murder.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

She was allowed to plead guilty to being an *accessory* and to child endangerment causing death.

When a man orders a death, he is the ring-leader and the one responsible.

When a woman orders a death, she is an accessory.⁶¹

Remembrance of Things False

The famous case that raised the curtain on "recovered memories" may now help ring down the curtain on this modern American witch hunt.

In 1989, Eileen Franklin accused her father in the long-unsolved murder of an 8-year-old girl. Eileen Franklin told police that as a little girl in 1969, she saw her father kill 8-year-old Susan Nason. But Franklin said she had "repressed" the memory completely from her conscious mind. She claimed that the memories came flooding back one day when, as an adult, she looked into her own daughter's eyes.

Though there was no physical evidence to support her claim, jurors convicted her father, George Franklin -- the first conviction based on "recovered memories."

But now George Franklin is being released. And that signals hope that the hysteria over "recovered memories" might be winding down.

This is not good news for those feminists who have long embraced the pseudo-science and circular logic of "recovered memories."

Prosecutors now know that Eileen Franklin lied about many things, including how her memories were "recovered." She had told other people that the memories originally came back as part of a dream. Then she told her brother the memories came back under hypnosis, then begged him to keep quiet when she learned that hypnosis-enhanced memory was not admissible in court. Some investigators count five different versions of how her memories supposedly returned. But by trial time, she had settled on the story about looking into her daughter's eyes.

Her mother initially believed her accusations. But it wasn't until after the trial that her mother heard about all the accusations Eileen Franklin made. Eileen claimed to have subconsciously relived the trauma of witnessing a murder by pulling out her hair

in the spot where the victim, Susan Nason, had been bashed in the head with a rock. She claimed this left a gaping bald spot through long periods of her childhood. Eileen's mother was shocked to hear of this after the trial. She recalls no bald spot, and none shows up in their numerous family photographs.

Eileen Franklin's accusations weren't the only thing odd about the trial. Her testimony contained errors that had appeared in newspaper articles of the murder. That suggests her memories were based on the what she read, rather than what she saw.

But the trial judge barred the defense from presenting this evidence because Eileen Franklin denied reading the papers!

And then the prosecution was allowed to tell jurors that she could have gotten those details only from seeing the murder.

She said that when she accused her father of the murder, he remained silent. The trial judge told jurors that George Franklin's silence in the face of this accusation could be considered a "confession."

These actions contributed to a federal judge overturning the conviction. And Eileen Franklin's credibility was not helped when she said she suddenly remembered a second murder her father committed. DNA evidence and records from a union meeting show he did not.

Also, her sister later testified that both she and Eileen had been hypnotized by a therapist -- despite Eileen Franklin's testimony to the contrary.

Feminists like to ask, "Why would she lie?" as if the inability to supply a reason for lying indicates that a woman is telling the truth.

Who knows why Eileen Franklin would lie? Her father certainly was not a nice man -- emotionally and perhaps physically abusive. So "recovering" those memories gave her an avenue to make him pay for his offenses -- whatever they may or may not be.

The "why would she lie" slogan indicates perhaps an over-eagerness on the part of many feminists to believe just about any accusation leveled at a man.

That certainly seems to be the case with recovered memories. "Recovered Memory Therapy," the arcane, convoluted pseudo-science that is used to retrieve these memo-

ries, has the full backing of many prominent feminists. Gloria Steinem has been a tireless champion of spreading the recovered memory gospel. As such, she has helped promote a socio-political "recovered memory" movement that has certainly put innocent people behind bars.

The problem with "Recovered Memory Therapy" is that it can recover just about any "memory" that a determined therapist goes fishing for. Therapists who believe in past lives often wind up leading their patients to memories of previous (or even future) lives. Those who believe in alien abductions can recover memories of being kidnaped aboard a flying saucer. Those who believe in Satanic cults tend to find that nearly everyone has been abused by a Satanic cult.

With recovered memories, the question should no longer be, "why would she lie?" The question for feminists today is, "how many innocent lives will you sacrifice before you stop believing?"⁶²

Fried Green History

You've read the novels, seen the movies, watched the TV shows. So you know that white women have been the closest ally of minorities. You know that white women were just as powerless as slaves, that they were victims and chattel, and that whenever they could, they took a stand against the oppressive white male.

At least, that's how it's told in the novels, movies and TV shows.

However, history has a habit of contradicting herstory, and historical documents have a way of showing that feminist fiction is -- well, fiction.

Take, for example, black slavery in the antebellum South.

We've heard the feminist take on this: white women were powerless to stop it, because they were no more than slaves themselves. And women's plight as helpless chattel has made them staunch allies and protectors of minorities everywhere. So the feminists say.

But researchers have gone to a better source: the actual white women of the Confederacy. They have examined diaries and letters by the female relatives who were put in charge of the plantations when the men were away at war. These records show a

remarkable lack of concern for the slaves they oversaw. No "Fried Green Tomato" solidarity here. The contemporary fiction of white women standing against the oppressor evaporates when exposed to reality.

For more detail, read "Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War," by Drew Gilpin Faust (University of North Carolina Press, \$29.95).

Here are excerpts from a review of her book in the May 9th New York Review of Books: "As Faust sees it, the old myths that Southern women were deeply submissive and carried on bravely and silently have also begun to fade."

When these women were forced into the job of overseeing the plantation while the men were away, "they had to learn fast," and running the plantation was more important to them than the well-being of their slaves. Women were now in a position of authority over the male overseers who still remained. But rather than softening the harsh treatment that overseers meted out to slaves, "some matrons adopted draconian measures." Having gained a position of power, they simply had men carry out their brutal orders.

If there was any softening in the treatment of slaves, Faust says, it was due more to the approach of Union armies, which made slave escapes and revolts more of a risk to these women. They treated their slaves better, not out of compassion, but to get cooperation.

These women were not so kind to anyone they considered beneath their caste. "Just as the reader is about to sympathize with a particular plantation mistress, whose distress Faust vividly describes, she furnishes instances of her cruelty, indifference, or snobbery. Plantation mistresses seldom thought kindly of women considered less fortunate in breeding or wealth than themselves. Their sometimes savage reactions toward women they disliked remind us once again how in human affairs drastically altered conditions can often fail to turn hearts from pride to penitence, from contempt to commiseration."

Those who claim that women are peacemakers, or that historically they had little power of influence, won't like what Faust has to say: "Faust begins her account by

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

pointing out that once a consensus for secession had been reached, Southern women of the upper classes quickly added their voices to the clamor -- particularly in the Deep South. Idle young men could expect to find a petticoat placed in their living quarters with a note attached ordering them to volunteer at once or be stigmatized. The power of public mockery by women drove many young men to the recruiting office. Some women displayed a frightening ferocity for war ..."

Many Confederate women embraced an ideal of masculine honor and instilled it -- or forced it on -- their sons and brothers. They felt that a man's life was worth less than his honor. One Mississippi senator questioned some veterans on why they had fought so hard for a cause they knew was lost. "We were afraid to stop. ... Afraid of the women at home. They would have been ashamed of us."

The book also won't be pleasant reading for those who insist that women steadfastly strove for freedom only to be held back by oppressive males. These women had gained unprecedented amounts of power and responsibility while the men were away, and longed to give it back. "The traditional denial of full citizenship was bearable for women; much harder to endure were the disappearance of necessities, the flight or intractability of slaves, and, above all, the absence of their male protectors, many of them never to come back at all." Many women, at the outset of the war, had told their men to come back covered in glory or else in a coffin. "After Appomattox they mainly wanted their shattered, unhappy men to reoccupy their place in parlor and bed, resume patriarchal obligations, and relieve them of the burdens they had taken up." "Confederate women fled from the responsibility of empowerment into the reassuring safety of tradition's protective shelter."

If this dose of reality is too much for you, you are invited to retreat to the nearest feminist novel or movie to restore your cherished image of the past.⁶³

Truth, Schmuth

Have you ever wondered why some feminists can embrace the most absurd claims, the wildest conspiracy theories, or the most dubious statistics? Well, it seems that at least

to some feminists, truth is a minor consideration, even an irritant. Note these recent items from a feminist newsgroup:

"As a new reader of Ms. Stuber's commentary magazine entitled "Catt's Claws" I have something to say to her detractors, if her writing bothers you, DON'T read it! Honestly, Ms. Stuber's accuracy on her stated "facts" didn't interest me in the least, it was her loud, lucid, witty, no B.S voice on woman's issues that I found thought provoking and compelling. What a nice change from the standard, mainstream, women's magazine. My personal thought that Ms. Stuber's views can go slightly overboard on certain topics is just simply that, an opinion. How I wish I had an opinion! As of late, my mind has felt an kinship to vanilla pudding, easy, light, universally acceptable, and yet totally bland and dull! I am glad that we feminist have an opinionated speaker in the forum, it helps us all by creating new, expanding dialogue to be shared and disputed amongst ourselves. Till next time...."

And more comments in a similar vein, from another feminist:

"[...] The problem with the women's movement is that it has become too divisive; this will never lead to anything except many less effective splinter groups that will significantly weaken any chance to be heard.

"I understand that sometimes it seems as if some feminists get a little exaggerant or they want to read sexism into everything, but, as supporters of this movement, we all need to ask ourselves if our first tendency to dismiss everything but the obvious isn't more detrimental. The truth is that there are still many cases of implicit sexism in our society today and by scrutinizing the issues, we allow ourselves the opportunity to figure out where the problems still exist.

"For the women's movement to ever gain any power, we are all going to have to sacrifice some of our beliefs. [...] When it comes to protecting any historically oppressed group, no matter how far they have apparently come, cohesion is imperative. I am willing to shelve some of my beliefs, no matter how wonderful I think they might be, in order to support the feminist cause..."[†]

"Peace."⁶⁴

* (Source: the soc.feminism newsgroup. Subject: Re: Catt's Claws bad for feminism? Date: Thu, 11 Jul 1996 02:05:33 GMT)

† (Source: the soc.feminism newsgroup. Subject: Re: Catt's Claws bad for feminism? Date: Mon, 8 Jul 1996 04:03:18 GMT)

Cosmowatch

(A regular feature -- unless it isn't -- depending on how long me and the Cosmo Girl last.)

Here's a look at some of the wisdom from the August 1996 issue of Cosmopolitan magazine:

Articles:

- "Men Can Be Sex Objects Too!"
- "Who Says You Have to Have Just One Lover?"
- "The Medea Syndrome: Women Who Murder Their Young (Are They Sick? Evil? Both?)"
- "On Company Time: How Much Can You Do For YOU?"
- "Just When You thought You Knew All There Was To Know About Orgasm"

Cartoons:

In one cartoon, a woman is disappointed that her date's home is not as rich as she'd been led to believe. In another, a woman at her apartment door smiles sweetly as she says to her date, "It's been a wonderful evening, so don't spoil it by asking to see me again."⁶⁵

Humor:

POW President Harasses Herself

Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women, is demanding that federal authorities bring sexual harassment charges against Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname.

"I was chuckling over some of my favorite books of feminist humor," Hyphenated-Lastname says, "when I realized that some of the jokes were sexual in nature. I hadn't planned on reading anything sexual in nature. In fact, it was all very unwelcome. Then I realized that by reading these unwelcome jokes, I was sexual harassing myself."

"It was not my intention to sexually harass myself," she says. "But intentions do not matter. The important thing is whether I *felt* harassed. And I did. By reading those jokes, I obviously was being subjected to a hostile reading environment."

"Because of this, I am now suing my own insurance company for emotional distress and punitive damages."

"But we're not after the money," she said. "We're after the publicity."

Hyphenated-Lastname is sure that her suit will be taken seriously. "After all, why would I lie?"

"POW believes that women can be sexually harassed even by underlings and subordinates. We have numerous cases of women professors being sexually harassed by males students who make lewd comments. So if you can be sexually harassed by an underling, why can't you be sexually harassed by yourself? It is entirely up to the victim to decide whether she felt harassed."

Meanwhile, Hyphenated-Lastname is seeking the help of the same experts who have helped President Clinton fight sexual harassment charges. "What I am told," she said, "is that because the harassment was done by someone we like, it doesn't count."

Hyphenated-Lastname also has hired an attorney to fight her own sexual harassment charges. "But we haven't seen the lawsuit yet, so we can't comment."

"The suit was filed in Walla Walla," said her attorney. "When we get a copy of it, we will have a tete-a-tete vis-a-vis Hyphenated-Lastname vs. Hyphenated-Lastname."

However, her attorney said: "Obviously, if she was harassed, then she was the victim, and she's not responsible for her actions in harassing herself."

"It's called the Battered Logic defense."⁶⁶

POW Reacts to Hillary Committing an Axe Murder

(What would the reaction be if Hillary Clinton committed an axe murder? Here's our version of the likely New York Times editorial, as written by Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women.)

We were as dismayed as anyone to see the videotape of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton hacking several orphan children to bits with an axe.

But before we rush to any conclusions, we would like to remind readers that this is an election year. Opponents have used the incident to attack Ms. Clinton, hammering away at her with an eye on the poll results.

We support a full investigation of the matter. If authorities find that Ms. Clinton exceeded her authority in chopping these in-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

fants to bits, then we will be the first to condemn her. But we believe the White House deserves a fair hearing on its contention that the axe was being used for official purposes only.

Hillary Clinton and the White House have not been forthcoming about all the details of the axe murders. This is probably due to Ms. Clinton's background as a lawyer, where she learned to never give up more information than she had to. Those who wish to attribute a more sinister motive to Ms. Clinton probably are just digging around for dirt.

With all the politics involved, it is difficult to sort out how much of the objection to axing infants is genuine, and how much of it is mere partisan mudslinging. Hillary has broken the traditional mold of quiet, unobtrusive first ladies, and she is paying a heavy price for her brave stand. Some of those who are screaming about the axe murders are simply people who do not like to see strong women step outside their traditional roles. To them, it would be fine if Hillary spent her life doing nothing but caring for children, and they are outraged that she dared to do anything different. Though we do not support axe murders per se, we do applaud the first lady for having the courage to defy traditional limitations that society has placed on women.

And to her critics, we would like to say: who has done more for children than Hillary? She has steadfastly defended children against the onslaught of "reformers" who are waging a war on children. It is remarkable how quickly those people start caring about our children merely because the first lady was seen killing a few of them.⁶⁷

Feminist Lifeguards

I recently went to the beach where all the lifeguards were feminists. As soon as I got out a bit from shore, I was hit with a terrible cramp in my leg and I couldn't swim. I called out to the lifeguards, "Help, I am drowning!" The first lifeguard said to the other, "Women are at a disadvantage in virtually every situation, so if you have a man and a woman who are both drowning, the woman is the one hardest hit." The other feminist lifeguard nodded, and they discussed this a bit.

I struggled back up to the surface, spitting out salt water, and cried out, "I am going to die!"

The second lifeguard said to the first, "Everyone is going to die sooner or later, but the real crisis is in women's health care." The first lifeguard nodded and cited a few studies that proved this was just so.

Then I knew I was about to go under for the dreaded third time. With my last breath I called out, "Ladies, I'm going down!"

So they jumped in, hauled me out, and sued me for sexual harassment.⁶⁸

AUGUST 1996

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of MANifesto where we ask: WHAT ARE MEN GOOD FOR? It's a serious question, and we take a look at how women and feminists approach this vexing issue. It turns out that men are good for a lot of thing -- like money, for example. They're also good for blaming everything on. And now and then they're good for dying in order to advance your social status on the party circuit. Read on, fellows, and find out how you can be of service to women.

Men Make Good Targets

[In] 1974, Terri Gilbert shot and killed her ex-husband.

She claimed she killed him in self defense.

She was never charged. Well, of course we know that domestic violence is a male thing. Killing them is okay -- "The Burning Bed" and all that.

But earlier this month, Gilbert shot and killed her current husband.

She claims she mistook him for a burglar.

Terri Gilbert, 49, had filed for divorce in March, on the grounds of "discord and conflict." Then one Sunday night she went into her basement and shot her current husband dead. She then called police and told them she had shot a "burglar."

There also is evidence that Gilbert had another husband in between these two marriages.

"It looks like there were three husbands, and we know two are dead," said Albuquerque, New Mexico, police lieutenant Richard

Tarango. "I'd like to know where the other one is."⁶⁹

Men are Good for Money

Here's some advice given out by Common Pleas Judge Shirley Strickland Saffold in a Cincinnati courtroom. Judge Saffold told a female defendant to dump her boyfriend and find a nice doctor to marry. "You can go sit in the bus stop, put on a short skirt, cross your legs and pick up 25. Ten of them will give you their money."

"Men are easy," the judge told defendant Katie Nemeth.

"If you don't pick up the first 10," the judge said, "then all you got to do is open your legs a little bit and cross them at the bottom and then they'll stop."

The judge must know what she's talking about. She is married to a doctor herself.

Nemeth had pleaded guilty to misusing a credit card that had been left in the store where she works. The judge gave Nemeth a \$200 fine.

According to a transcript of the hearing, the judge also told Nemeth she should break up with her boyfriend because "all of the women in prisons across these United States of America are there because of a guy." Apparently she attributes the real blame to the boyfriend because Nemeth's lawyer claimed that the boyfriend was the one who actually misused the credit card.

Hmmm. So if the credit card is lost in this woman's store, and somehow it's given to the boyfriend to misuse -- obviously that's the man misleading the woman.

Now if the boyfriend had worked in the store where the credit card was lost, and if he gave it to his girlfriend to misuse -- hmm, that's obviously the crooked man being the ringleader and leading the innocent little waif astray.

So men are also good for blaming a woman's offenses on.⁷⁰

Dead Men are Good for Alimony

The first wife of "Star Trek" creator Gene Roddenberry wants to boldly go where no alimony has gone before: into the future and beyond death.

Eileen Roddenberry wants a cut of the profits from the new spinoff stories and

products that Gene Roddenberry created after their divorce.

We understand the idea of married couples sharing in the property and assets they acquire during their marriage. We understand how one spouse can contribute directly or indirectly to the other's success, even if just by offering support and encouragement. We understand how a spouse can make sacrifices to help the other's career.

But Eileen Roddenberry thinks she's entitled to the profits from work her husband did after they split up -- as if a woman is entitled to her ex-husband's entire future. She wasn't supporting him as he created the new series and stories. And if those ventures had gone belly up, we doubt she would have shared in any of the sacrifices -- say, by demanded that her alimony be cut.

Eileen Roddenberry still gets a lucrative share of the profits from the original "Star Trek" show. Oddly enough, that means she now gets more money from "Star Trek" than Gene Roddenberry himself. That's because he's dead. There's a certain science-fiction-esque sort of logic in hopping back and forth in time to claim future profits from a dead man.

But her profits might have reached their final frontier: the California Supreme Court ruled she wasn't entitled to a cut of the profits from the spinoffs that Roddenberry created after their divorce.

We certainly hope the judge looked at her and, in a decent "Scotty" voice, told her: "The lady dinna ha' a leg to stand on."

But we'd settle for a decent Captain Kirk voice telling her: "Why ... don't ... you ... get ... a ... JOB!"⁷¹

Men are Good for Kicks

Convicted rapist Reginald Muldrew -- known in California as "the Pillowcase Rapist" -- was kicked and beaten nearly to death by a mob of men in Gary, Indiana, on August 5. The men believed Muldrew had just attacked a woman. He was caught with her purse. Some of them bashed his head with a brick.

From a feminist standpoint, this severe beating is puzzling. Feminist truth-seekers have told us that all men are potential rapists. Why then did this group of men attack "one of their own," as it were?

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

There has to be a logical explanation. Feminist truth-seekers have told us that rape is the normal mode of male sexual expression, that rape is as institutionalized and acceptable to men as football, that society tolerates and even advocates sexual violence.

And yet here is a bunch of men in Gary, Indiana, who seemed to have registered a rather strong objection to an assault on a woman.

What can the possible explanation be, in feminist terms?

Well, maybe they were just upset that he got to the woman first.⁷²

Little Boys are Bloody Good

A practicing witch who drives a school bus was convicted of statutory rape for seducing a 14-year-old boy who testified that she forced him to lick her blood.

Kerri Lynn Patavino, 28, met the boy when he was a middle-school student. The boy said she took him out for pizza last year and seduced him. He tried to break off the relation when she started cutting herself with a razor during sex and forcing him to lick the blood, he said.

Patavino practices Wicca, an ancient nature religion.

Patavino didn't take it very well when the youngster she called "l.b." for "little boy" tried to break up with her. Prosecutors say she broke into the boy's home and stole several items, including a skateboard. Thus she also was convicted of burglary and larceny. Apparently this backward jury hasn't been paying attention to modern movies, where it's considered very "empowering" for women to commit revenge acts like these against former lovers.

And she also was accused of giving the boy drugs.

Patavino's lawyer, Joseph Mirsky, doesn't see what all the fuss over statutory rape is all about. "If I was 15, I would have loved it. I wouldn't complain," he said.

We suppose he probably wouldn't mind drinking his client's blood, either. But then again, he IS a lawyer.

Patavino claims the boy lied about having sex with her. But we have to reject that claim out of hand because feminists have told us that rape victims never lie and that

questioning any rape claim makes you part of the backlash. Certainly we wouldn't want to be part of any backlash.

Besides, the prosecution has the love letters that Patavino wrote to the boy.

Some are signed in blood.⁷³

Men are Good for Following Orders

"Attention, men: Here is a list of our demands."

That might as well have been the opening for a recent list that a feminist posted on the Internet under the title "41 Ways To Tell If Your Man Is A Feminist."

This remarkable list was essentially a set of instructions spelling out the conduct the woman expects from a suitable boyfriend. It shows that some women can submit a list of manipulative, one-sided demands knowing some men somewhere will jump through the hoops to get into her good graces.

Some parts of the list involve men simply not being jerks ("He always walks with you. He doesn't get in these moods where you're forced to walk two or three paces behind him. ... He doesn't refer to your breasts as hooters.") But mostly it involved the prospective boyfriend agreeing to support the feminist no matter how radical, self-centered, ideological, bizarre or funky she gets.

Along the way, she rejects traditional chivalry, at least a little. ("He doesn't open doors for you, but he doesn't let it slam in your face if you happen to be the second one through the door either.") Here is one of those awkward situations where whatever you do can be wrong if you don't read her mind precisely. So you're expected to keep the door open for her. But when does keeping doors open for her become opening doors for her? If she's too far away when you hold it open, have you transgressed by appearing to be opening it for her? Hold it open a bit too long, and you've sinned.

But this feminist is not willing to dispense with chivalry entirely. The suitable boyfriend is still expected to defend her honor ("He doesn't let other men put you down or call you names.") He is still expected to assume his traditional role of protector and guardian. But now he is also expected to defend feminism as well as the female: ("When his friends ask him, 'What's with

your girlfriend? Is she some kind of fucking feminist?", he nods his head proudly and says, "Yes.") Yet he is expected to attend feminist rallies where a great deal of anti-male rhetoric could fly, and he's expected to go there with a woman who makes no similar commitment to objecting to anti-male hatred. In fact, he is even supposed to joyfully embrace anti-male groups ("He's got a Riot Grrrls T-Shirt.") And he has to go to the Women's Day March ... just so long as he "doesn't try to pick up other women."

He is required to read feminist philosophy. (She is not offering to read up on or even acknowledge men's issues, father's rights, etc.) And he is required to swallow the idea that feminists represent all women ("He reads feminist philosophy every now and then because he's interested in what's on women's minds nowadays.")

Similarly, he is expected to accept the feminist line that feminism is whatever a feminist says it is. ("Most men are feminists! Yes, it's true.") ... "When you tell him Pamela Anderson Lee is a feminist icon, he says, "Cool.")

There, there. Good boy.

He's also expected to be accepting when you have an alternate-reality episode ("He's fascinated by witchcraft. What man isn't?") Well, maybe that "little boy" referred to above who was forced to drink one Wiccan's blood.

And speaking of alternate reality episodes, this feminist has some concepts of men that go beyond caricature. She says the good boyfriend "doesn't shriek like you're going to castrate him every time you pick up a knife to cut some vegetables."

Have men **really** been shrieking around this woman? If so, then frankly we can't blame them.

The boyfriend "will admit that there is a 50/50 possibility of a chance that God is a woman," says the feminist, who is not required to admit a 50/50 chance that Satan is a woman.

The properly trained boyfriend doesn't expect you to adhere to your feminist principles when they are no longer to your advantage ("He doesn't expect you to pay for the entire restaurant bill because you're a feminist.")

But he is expected to adopt whatever politically correct assault on the language you are promoting: ("He doesn't call an actor of the feminine persuasion an actress.")

He is expected to accept the woman "as is." ("When someone criticizes you for not shaving your legs, he says, "So what? I don't shave mine either." "He thinks the hair under your arms is "very Parisian.") All this and more is contained in a list of instructions from a woman who very obviously has no intention of accepting men just as they are. All throughout this list, this Riot-Grrl-embracing feminist has given no indication she feels obligated to be sensitive toward her boyfriend, object to male-bashing, listen to his concerns, think of his rights, or consider HIM and equal to HER.

But here is the requirement that most stamps her man as an obedient lap dog: "He'll go to the store and buy Tampax for you. It makes him proud." Now, we understand the idea doing things for the person you love. We can understand picking up feminine hygiene products and so on, out of love and consideration. But her boyfriend is required to be **proud** of it. What is she training here -- an equal partner, or mama's li'l helper?

The list has a lot of demands about how he will treat "your gay girlfriends" and what he will do "When he meets your "dyke" friends." The frequent emphasis on lesbianism is quite interesting, especially considering that your man qualifies as a feminist if "He takes you along to the strip club with him."

Hmmm.

So if you comply with all the demands on this list, what can you expect? You've got a hairy-legged, hairy-armed Riot Grrrl who expects you to fetch her Tampax while she's off with her lesbian friends practicing witchcraft.

Yeah, we know. It sounds almost too good to pass up.⁷⁴

Men can be Taken for Granted

Sandy Hill Pittman got to the top of Mount Everest by way of MTV.

Along the way, the lives of a few men were placed at risk.

But apparently not so that Ms. Pittman would notice them much.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Ms. Pittman is an avid, but amateur, mountaineer. She married and divorced Bob Pittman, who created MTV. The divorce has left her with enough money to pursue her dreams, which include being the third woman in history to scale the highest mountains on all seven continents.

Those dreams also include promoting herself shamelessly on the society pages and gossip columns. "She's a show-off," one friend told *Vanity Fair* magazine. "She is a beautiful California girl, but she has a lot of chutzpah."*

In one failed effort to scale Everest, Pittman hired four of the world's top climbers to help her. Though her guides did most of the work, fixing the ropes for her to follow, she portrayed herself as their equal. In lectures, she called them her "climbing team." She managed to get a Vaseline commercial out of the deal, where she got herself referred to as a "world-class climber." It drew hoots of derision from seasoned mountaineers.

It's a pattern that's not unique to Pittman. Increasingly we have seen female soldiers who *accidentally* come under enemy fire being hailed as heroes who did "equal work" or took "equal risks." Feminists and the news media love to find female soldiers who participate on the sidelines of action and then claim that they are "standing alongside the men." And many corporations today will hire female "show" executives to take prominent positions on boards or in executive suites -- and to collect the nice paychecks -- and then quietly hire men to do the real work.

Some women do carry their own weight and contribute equally. But then there are those like Pittman, who seize on any participation at all and magnify it into an "equal share."

Pittman signed up with another Everest expedition in May of 1996, organized by professional Scott Fischer of the Seattle-based Mountain Madness company. Pittman staged a sendoff party for herself, attended by such celebs as Bianca Jagger and Calvin Klein, and she promoted the trip with a Web site featuring her trip diary sent by satellite phone from Everest. Pittman's publicity-

seeking continued at Everest. Instead of promoting herself as merely an equal on this expedition, she had friend Tom Brokaw and NBC focus on her, and co-opt all of Fischer's party as the "NBC Everest Assault" expedition. While the other climbers were resting at camp in preparation for the climb, she hiked five hours down the mountain to promote herself before admirers, stopping for a "Today" show interview.

Perhaps she should have rested. She made it to the summit, though some said a Sherpa guide had to pull her along. Then a surprise storm struck. It soon turned deadly.

Pittman faltered and fatigued badly on the way down, and had to be helped. She was disoriented, confused. She was given an injection of dexamethasone to help her. She got shots of pure oxygen from someone else's supply.

One of the people who risked his life to help her was Neal Beidleman, an elite climber from Aspen. He recalls her stumbling around, getting tangled, making mistakes. He helped her cross a particularly treacherous stretch. She was begging to rest, but he made her go on. Otherwise, she would die.

The storm grew worse: whiteout conditions with winds of fifty miles an hour. Night fell, and the windchill factor reached 100 degrees below freezing. Pittman huddled with others.

In the morning, only Beidleman could go on. He got to one of the camps and alerted a Russian guide, Anatoli Boukreev, that Pittman and other climbers were in danger. Boukreev went out into the deadly storm but couldn't find them. He went out again and located Pittman and the others. It took several trips to get them back, at extensive risk to his own life. Boukreev had to half-drag, half carry Pittman back to camp.

Pittman was one of the survivors. Eight other climbers died on Everest in that storm. They included Scott Fischer, her guide, who died trying to help other climbers.

But Pittman had other concerns: her reputation.

She had promoted herself as a world-class mountaineer. But she had faltered badly, and she would have died if not for the selfless dedication of several men.

* ("Blind Ambition," *Vanity Fair*, August 1996, page 81.)

She was "worried about her image, her book," other climbers told Vanity Fair. "She was worried about damage control."

When Pittman got down from the mountain, she began acting like a feminist "herstory" who does not wish to acknowledge the contributions and sacrifices men have made on her behalf: "There were those who felt that she tried to keep her distance from Beidleman and Boukreev, the men who had risked their own necks to save hers. During an NBC interview and a lengthy background session with Newsweek the day before, Pittman never mentioned that she had been in serious jeopardy or that she would probably have died had she not been helped by Beidleman and Boukreev. In a subsequent telephone conversation, when asked about her apparent lack of appreciation toward the two gentlemen who had saved her life, Pittman responded tersely: "Which two gentlemen is that?"

"Which two gentlemen is that?" That could well be the battle cry of feminists who do not wish to acknowledge the men who take risks, and sometimes bleed, and sometimes die, to protect women like them.

We have seen reactions like Pittman's before. We have seen women who cannot seem to see the sacrifices of men.

Pittman says there were no heroes, that the guides were just doing their jobs.

Throughout history, it has been the job of men to protect women, or to die trying. People like Pittman now take it for granted. The reality of these men's bravery, dedication, and sacrifice does not seem to enter her mind. She seems to expect male service and sacrifice as her birthright. It is men's proper gender role.

And men have played that role well. We have been willing to give up our lives to protect the womenfolk. We have sent women a message -- our lives are worth less than yours. And this message has become established as the natural order of things. It is so well established that there are some to whom the lives and sacrifices of men are almost too insignificant to notice.

We know that women are perfectly willing to get into the lifeboats while men stay on the sinking ship. We have seen societies willing to sacrifice the lives of its boys to protect its women. We have seen women

take that sacrifice for granted. It is so ingrained that some of them seem incapable of grasping the entirety of the fact that the lives of men are being put at risk, or destroyed.

We have seen feminists who don't seem to care if a man is innocent or guilty, so long as punishing him will further their agenda or "send the right message." Well, why *should* they care? For centuries we have told them that our lives are worth less than theirs. We have told them that it is acceptable to sacrifice men's lives to protect women's safety.

And in that atmosphere, we have seen girls send innocent men to prison on false rape accusations because they were afraid their boyfriends might have gotten them pregnant. They are willing to sacrifice a man just to avoid unpleasantness with their parents. That is the legacy of telling women that they are the ones who deserve to be protected by sacrificing men.

We have seen women falsely accuse men of rape in order to get sympathy or attention from their husbands. We have seen feminist women -- who live an average seven years longer than men -- claim that they are shortchanged on health care and demand that we spend more money on them. We have seen feminists gloss over the fact that most victims of violence are men and demand increased protection for women. We have seen feminists call a man a "monster" if he hits a woman, and call a woman a "victim" when she kills her two infant sons. We have seen feminists demand that women be allowed into the military, and then seen women get pregnant to avoid hazardous duty, so that men must face the dangers in their place. We have seen feminist make false accusations of racism against men they accused of sexism -- using any tactic they can think of to extract their revenge and destroy a man's career, and at times even his life. We have seen feminist administrators who feel that it's a beneficial, sensitizing experience when men are falsely accused of rape or assault.

For these women, it's as if the damage done to men does not even register in their conscious minds, or their conscience. Society has always told them that men should be sacrificed to protect them, that men's lives are less valuable.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

And indeed, it's not their fault. It's the men who have established the rule of "women and children first." Perhaps the women whispered in our ears, "You cannot let us suffer, you must do something." But we were the ones who made the rules, who decided our lives were worth less.

And modern feminism springs from that soil. Feminists have cultivated that soil with generous doses of anti-male stereotypes and hatreds. It has always been acceptable to sacrifice men. Now it is downright moral to do so -- because men are evil, men are oppressors, men are violent, and so on. They have always found it acceptable to sacrifice men to preserve themselves. Now, as they march toward their feminist paradise, they need not be concerned with such annoying details as whose dreams, or whose lives, they are destroying.

As for Pittman, she wants to include her Everest adventure in a book with the narcissistic title, "Summits of My Soul." Perhaps there she will find enough room for a footnote to thank the men who risked their lives so that she could go on enjoying her Kieselstein-Cord jewelry, her Dean & DeLuca espresso, her shopping sprees at Bergdorf's and her dinners in this season's fashionable restaurants.

As for the soul she is glorifying -- it is a bit less majestic than the Himalayas. And the summits of her soul have deep and dark crevasses, where the lives of men can disappear, without a trace, without a sound.⁷⁵

Men Take Away Sin

Women: Have you ever done something bad -- something petty or mean-spirited?

Well, fret no more. Feminism introduces a new product that wipes out guilt instantly. It's called "men."

Just add a dash of "men" and your responsibility vanishes -- just like magic! "Men" remove the toughest culpability, wipe out the most stubborn accountability, and even get rid of moral liability.

How much would you pay for this service? Wait, don't answer yet! You also get the ability to blame men for any female infraction throughout all history.

Now how much would you pay? Well, put away your credit card, because the ability to blame men is absolutely free!

And to show you how well it works, we're giving you a free sample right here! Just watch "men," with the amazing miracle ingredient "responsibility," take away the sins of sexist women -- according to these comments recently posted on the Internet. (The topic was feminists who engage in man-bashing behavior.):

T-shirts and numerous other products ridiculing, dehumanising and attacking women are also commonplace ... Yes, some women have sadly gone for *emulating* men's habit of such tastless and hateful things.

[...]

Yes, I agree that many women have bought into stooping as low as men had been in the past [...]

However, these new products are competing with woman-bashing ones. Not all women find them funny, and more and more women are commenting about the tastelessness (admittedly, with accurate comments like, "Let's not be like some sleazy men here, ok? This is dumb and sexist." INdeed, many men had set the standard, and some women are simply joining in lowering theirs.) ...

That women now are making jokes about men in the comedy circle is definitely a response, in return to something men started.*

See how it works? If feminists are petty and sexist, the answer is to tell them not to be like men! The answer is to trace every offense back to men. (Of course, you can bet the feminist who said this would be quite upset if someone said that when women engage in the major religions, fine arts or the sciences, they are only imitating men's good examples. Heck that would be sexist, wouldn't it? And we all know that feminists oppose sexism.)⁷⁶

One Heck of a Diversity Leader

Ruth Pierce, a senior Social Security Administration official, got up in front of a conference in June and told the following joke: A fisherman meets a mermaid, and he asks the mermaid to make him "five times smarter." So the mermaid turns him into a woman.

The joke got a big laugh from women in the audience. Honest. (Perhaps these particu-

* (Source: "Re: FREE "MEN SUCK" T-SHIRTS ON THE WEB!!" thread, posted on alt.feminism and other Usenet groups.)

lar women could have used the ministrations of the mermaid themselves.)

Well, that's typical, run-of-the-mill sexism -- nothing you haven't heard if you listen to women in the workplace for very long.

But Ruth Pierce is the top diversity official in the Social Security Administration.

That's right. She's a political appointee in charge of promoting diversity and making sure this governmental workplace is free of sexism.

And the conference where she told the joke was a diversity conference.*

That the top diversity official could blithely tell an anti-male joke during a diversity conference -- and find the joke welcome, and still be kept in power by the administration -- points up what a lot of men are finding out about feminism and "diversity." "Diversity" has become a code word for a anti-male attitudes, actions and policies. It is a doctrine promoted by people who have no intention of practicing "diversity" themselves. "Diversity" means "you have to tolerate me, but I don't have to tolerate you." "Diversity" means "bigotry against me is illegal, but bigotry against you is official policy."

As Orwell noted, if you want to create a bureaucracy to hide the truth, you can call it The Ministry Of Truth. And if you want to create a program of sexism, bigotry, and intolerance, you can call it "Diversity."⁷⁷

Cosmowatch

Here's a look at some of the wisdom from the September 1996 issue of Cosmopolitan magazine:

Articles:

- "I Left My Husband For Another Woman"
- "Why *Should* You Stop Flirting? Sensuous gestures let a man know you're interested."
- "My Sizzling, *Real-Life* Version of 9-Weeks: One woman's erotic adventure with a dangerously addictive man."
- "Bigger is Better? The Controversial Cosmetic Surgery for HIM."
- "It's Okay To ..." (This is a list of things Cosmo says it's okay to think or do). A sample:

It's okay to:

- o Sleep with several different men.
- o Carry your diaphragm in your purse on a first date ... just in case.
- o Describe his lovemaking, including penis size, to your best friend.
- o Want a rich husband.

Cartoons:

- A woman tells her date, "If you really loved me, you'd be better looking." (page 134)
- Before going up to her apartment, a woman warns her date she can physically hurt him.

Also, here are some items being cited in an ad campaign for the new women's magazine Marie Claire. Hoping to lure subscribers, the ads throw out tantalizing bits like these:

- Ballbusters: Success Secrets of Pushy Women
- Cheating. Is it natural? Wicked? A temporary tonic for boredom?
- Clothes to lust after. The concept is *so Marie Claire.* Winning with clothes that make you feel happy. Comfortable. Reveling. In your own glorious skin.
- Raging Adultery Hormones.
- Adultery: Yes? No? Maybe.⁷⁸

Humor:

POW demands Affirmative Action in Combat

By the Per Broadcasting System

The world needs to establish new combat rules that will make warfare a more safe and nurturing environment for women soldiers, says Ms. Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women.

"Women can kill just as well as men," says Hyphenated-Lastname. "We know this from all our clients who claim the 'battered woman's defense.' But the patriarchy has set up certain roadblocks to discourage women from combat. Chief among these roadblocks is the fact that women who go into combat risk getting killed. The patriarchy knows this is a major deterrent to women advancing to positions of power in the military. Well, it is time to remove this 'Kevlar ceiling.'"

"We demand the creation of a new 'Gender Convention' that replaces the old, male-drafted 'Geneva Convention.' It will extend

* (Source: "A Conference, a Joke, A New Look at Sexism," *The Washington Post*, July 27, 1996, Page One.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

the "Violence Against Women Act" to apply to combat, because violence against women is always wrong. Just because a female soldier is trying to kill you, that doesn't give you the right to shoot back. Violence against women is never justified, and we must bring all male abusers to swift and uncompromising justice."

"Our records show that nearly one-hundred and twenty-five percent of all female soldiers says that they feel that warfare constitutes a hostile working environment. Obviously, women soldiers will never achieve true equality until they feel safe and accepted on the battlefield."

"Thus we demand the creating of new Nuremberg Trials to bring to justice all enemy soldiers who have hung up centerfolds in their trenches or called out 'Hey baby, wanna date?' from the foxholes."

"We hope to further the cause of women in warfare in just the same manner as we do in the construction trades, fire departments, and police forces. Instead of demanding that women perform the same as men, we demand that the standards be lowered."

"In order to achieve equality in the military, we have required that women soldiers and even VMI cadets not have to meet the same physical requirements as men. We now want foreign nations to comply with our lowered standards. For example, women in the military are not required to run as quickly as men. If our female troops are running late, all enemy troops on a battlefield will be required to wait until the women get there."

"Also, female combat pilots like the late Lt. Kara Hultgreen do not have to meet the same standards as men (as noted in the August edition of *American Spectator* magazine.) So if female pilots do not hit as many targets as male pilots, we are demanding that the enemy blow up some of their own targets until equality is achieved."

"We also support the concept of 'executive pilots.' These would be women who sit up front in the plane to take all the credit and receive the higher rank and pay while a man sits behind them and does the actual work. This arrangement has worked well for some of the top women executives in our country."

"American advertisers and the news media have shown enormous support for these demands. For example, shoe-maker Nike is

unveiling a new line of combat boots just for women. We would like to show you an excerpt from the Nike commercial."

(Cue television monitor. TV screen shows images of strong, confident women gracefully jumping trenches and bayonetting men. Voiceover says:)

"If you let me fight ... I will gain confidence, and rank."

"If you let me fight ... I will be less likely to stay in an abusive, target-rich environment."

"If you let me fight ... I can collect scads of data on violence against women."

"If you let me advance in the military without doing my fair share ... I can gain all sorts of power and send lots of men to die defending my rights."

"If you let me fight"⁷⁹

POW gets to the Bottom of the Diaper Conspiracy

DEAR READERS: For a while now I've been doing parodies of a fictional feminist group called the Propaganda Organization for Women (POW). But some readers have claimed that my lampoons are too wild and unbelievable. They say I should discuss real feminist beliefs instead of making them up.

Problem is, some real feminist beliefs are wilder than anything I could ever make up.

Case in point: Here is an honest to goodness, genuine, real feminist conspiracy theory about ... diapers! A feminist looked into the practice of selling different diapers for boys and girls, and she found a conspiracy. (Of course, if you look into diapers, you're liable to find a load of this sort of stuff.)

Anyway, here is this genuine, real feminist conspiracy, presented without further ado.

[One feminist wrote:]

Recently, being about to face the prospect in a few months of having to buy diapers, I went out to see where the diaper industry had gotten with this issue. Now, they offer diapers which work "for either boys or girls", as though they are offering some new technological innovation! I sometimes have cynical moments when I wonder if the whole thing was just a marketing ploy [...]

[Another feminist replied:]

Your cynicism is 100% on the mark. [...] I honestly think the boy/girl diapers was both a conscious sexist attempt to perpetuate stereotypes in the designs on the diapers, *and* a desire to increase shelf space allotted to a diaper company. The introduction of the "works for boys and girls" diapers were just greed, though, not any social engineering. More shelf space.

Don't call me paranoid; I've read way too much social psychology to not know what I'm talking about. Feminism is a movement to change the way people think, and to think that those currently in power (and mostly male) would not fight back with known methods of shaping culture is foolish. [...] No, it isn't cynicism, it is realism, and an awareness that feminism is a cultural thing -- and to succeed we *need* to change the culture. To expect that those in power would fight it is not paranoia, it is a challenge! :~)⁸⁰

There you have it, folks. Diapers are a patriarchal conspiracy. As for me, I say we should salute those dedicated diaper executives. They have gone above and beyond the call of doody.⁸¹

SEPTEMBER 1996

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of MANifesto where we take a look at the moral leadership that we can expect from women as they guide us across the bridge to the future and into the 21st Century. For example, there is a move on today to make sure that the position of Secretary General of the United Nations will go to a woman next. (After all, she could hardly be less effective than Boutros Boutros-Ghali.) So it will be interesting to see if the powers that be decide they're going to hire some woman -- any woman -- no matter what. Remember what happened when Bill Clinton decided he absolutely had to have a female Attorney General. What an exciting thought for us all! Just think -- maybe someone in charge of U.N. troops can do for the world what Janet Reno did for Waco, Texas.

Feminists have told us that putting women in charge will make for a more peaceful, honest and civilized world. We salute these forward-looking sentiments by taking a gander at the great moral stances taken by women and feminists everywhere.

Dedication: Carol Moseley-Braun

We'd like to dedicate this issue about feminist ethics to Senator Carol Moseley-Braun of Illinois.

1992 was dubbed the "Year of the Woman," and Moseley-Braun was a big part of it. For one thing, she defeated a man to win her Senate seat. And not just any male senator, but one who actually dared to question Anita Hill's claims of sexual harassment. Women were mad. They wanted to oust that male senator and replace him with someone with a bit more sensitivity to the oppressed. When Moseley-Braun won, it was called a major feminist victory, part of the drive to take power out of the hands of corrupt and greedy men and give it to the disenfranchised and downtrodden.

So how has Senator Moseley-Braun advanced those principles?

Well, she has become a close ally, supporter and apologist for one of the most brutal dictators on Earth.

General Sani Abacha rules Nigeria with an iron fist. He executes and tortures dissidents, smashes the free press, oppresses people of color, and loots the nation's wealth for every dime he can extort from it.

Just the type of person a moral, forward-looking feminist would want to support.

Moseley-Braun won office largely because women were offended over what they saw as harsh treatment for Anita Hill. So Moseley-Braun now chums up to a man who does things a bit tougher than finding hairs on his Coke can.

While many nations are calling for international sanctions against Abacha, Moseley-Braun has been speaking out in his defense. She's about the only one to do so, especially in Congress. The State Department was not pleased to learn that Moseley-Braun had made a secret trip to Nigeria on business that she has not quite yet clarified.

Those looking for answers to Moseley-Braun's affections for a brutal tyrant might want to take a look at her former fiancé, Kgosie Matthews. He was her campaign manager and also shared a condo with her.

He also was a paid agent of the Nigerian government.

But if you're a feminist, you might not want to look too hard at Mr. Matthews.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Some of Moseley-Braun's staff accused him of sexual harassment.

Moseley-Braun ran for office by exploiting the rage and national publicity over the Anita Hill sexual harassment case. Then sexual harassment charges started hitting a bit closer to home. Sort of like a candidate running on a law-and-order platform by day and hanging out with felons and grifters by night.

The national rage focused on the Anita Hill case seemed to skip right over the sexual harassment accusations against Matthews. But if feminists were moved to so much anger by the charges Anita Hill made, why did they have so little outrage over the accusations against Matthews? Or, for that matter, the accusations made by Gennifer Flowers and Paula Jones?

Well, here we can see that stringent feminist morality at work. The rule of thumb: if the accusation involves someone we like, it doesn't count.⁸²

A Feminist Defends Free Speech ... Well, Sort Of

There were a lot of people who strongly condemned the Republicans because pro-abortion speakers were not given time to state their views during the GOP national convention.

One of them was outspoken feminist Bella Abzug. (See, we can be charitable. We referred to her only as "outspoken.")

Ms. Abzug accused the convention of "muzzling some of their guys who didn't agree with them about abortion."

Well, let syndicated columnist Nat Hentoff tell you what happened next: "A reporter for the New York Post asked her what she thought of her own party's refusal to allow Robert Casey, governor of Pennsylvania from 1987 to 1995, to speak at her convention. After all, Al Gore had promised on ABC-TV: 'We don't have a gag rule the way the other party does.'"

"So what?" said Abzug, the tribune of free speech, about the gagging of Casey. "It's not required to have someone speak who has a position in contrast to the majority of the party." Casey is pro-life, so he had to be silenced."

Abzug defended free speech -- for her views only. She did not extend those rights to others.*

That's sort of like defending "equality for women."⁸³

Women Clean Up Politics ... (Well, at Least they Clean Up)

Benazir Bhutto -- seeking another term as prime minister of Pakistan -- ran on an anti-corruption campaign. Since winning in 1993, she hasn't done much toward cleaning up the government. But a luxurious estate she reportedly bought in England indicates that at least she *is* cleaning up.

Pakistan has long had a reputation for corrupt governmental and business practices. In a recent survey, business executives ranked Pakistan as the second most corrupt, behind Nigeria. But on the campaign trail, Bhutto said, "I will not compromise on political corruption of any member of the ruling coalition."

But Bhutto has appointed several cabinet members who have been accused of financial crimes. When Bhutto was out of power, she accused the Saifullah family of being a "plunderer" of the nation's wealth. But when she came back to power, she appointed a powerful member of the family to her cabinet. "Then last month, her government exempted a cement company co-owned by the Saifullah family from \$400 million in excise taxes, disregarding the objections of the national tax collection agency."

Her critics say it's a pattern of Bhutto treating her allies to some lucrative business deals. Obviously there's some partisan sniping going on here, with charges being hurled by people whose hands aren't particularly clean either. But there certainly have been an unusual number of shady associates for someone who ran so loudly on an anti-corruption platform.

For example, there's Mohammad Nawaz Khokhar, who used to be a fierce critic of Bhutto. He has been arrested on charges of fraud, embezzlement and official corruption. But he was released from jail, and a day later he switched his allegiance to Bhutto's party

* (Source: "The Democrats' Tiny Tent: The Siberian exile of a former governor with one of the party's most effective records," By Nat Hentoff, *The Washington Post*, Wednesday, September 4 1996; Page A15.)

and was named science and technology minister. The charges against him then were dropped.

Then there's Munawwer Hussain Manj, arrested on charges of being a major trafficker of hashish and heroin. He was named to a parliamentary committee that oversees anti-drug operations.

When Pakistan recently permitted private ownership of TV and FM radio stations, it granted a national TV monopoly and favorable FM deals, without bids and without announcements they were available. They went -- free of fees -- to someone who was an important aide to Bhutto and a high school classmate of her husband.

But, according to Britain's Sunday Express paper, she's not sitting out the deals herself. The paper reported that Bhutto and her husband had bought a \$3.9 million mansion in the English countryside near London -- a 335-acre estate with a private landing strip and indoor swimming pool. Loads of antiques, carved furniture and other household items were reportedly shipped from Bhutto's private seaside residence in Karachi to London.

Bhutto denies that she bought the estate.

So what's going on with Pakistan's economy in the meantime? Bhutto's latest budget calls for a \$1 billion tax increase, and the International Monetary Fund is pressing her to impose even greater fiscal austerity. Bhutto probably isn't any more corrupt than any of her predecessors. But -- contrary to feminist dogma -- she isn't any more honest, either.* She is truly equal to men.⁸⁴

So Nicely they Settle Their Disputes

Feminists say that women make better leaders because they are by nature more cooperative and nurturing, less aggressive and combative. Women will settle their disputes nicely, so the feminists say.

So it's interesting to look at a recent dustup in New York state between a couple of high-ranking women in the GOP, as reported June 5 in the New York Daily News:

"Open warfare erupted between Lt. Gov. Betsy McCaughey Ross and (Governor George) Pataki administration yesterday as both sides traded accusations of betrayal and deceit.

"Escalating an embarrassing Republican feud, McCaughey Ross used a radio talk show to accuse unnamed Pataki aides of 'McCarthyism' for allegedly targeting her with a series of political shots.

"This is the strategy that Joe McCarthy used to discredit his political adversaries,' McCaughey Ross said on WABC's 'Lionel' show, blaming the Pataki administration for leaking allegations that she abused her state police detail and mounting other attacks.

"He would leak anonymous rumors that they had done something wrong but never actually provide any concrete charges ... and never give the accused person an opportunity to prove his innocence. It's un-American,' she said.

"The Pataki administration fired back even as she spoke. State Parks Commissioner Bernadette Castro called the radio show and angrily accused McCaughey Ross of 'slandering' the administration.

"You're not loyal to the governor,' Castro charged, as she and McCaughey interrupted each other with accusations. 'You're not loyal to the Republican Party.'

"... The extraordinary public sniping created new embarrassment for the Pataki administration ..."

Well! We're certainly glad no men were involved here.

Otherwise it might have gotten nasty.⁸⁵

Women are More Artistic and Sensitive

We've been told that women are more sensitive, more moral, more artistic.

That's when we remember a sensitive, moral art project that took place at the University of Maryland in 1993. Students in the "Contemporary Issues in Feminist Art" class took the names of men at random from a campus phone book. They then put up posters listing these men by name under the heading that said: "Notice: These Men are Potential Rapists."

Well, we might not know art, but we know what we *don't* like. And that includes smearing the names of innocent people,

* (Source: "Beleaguered Benazir Bhutto: Corruption Charges Grow Sharper Against Premier Re-elected Vowing to Rid Pakistan's Politics of Graft" By Kenneth J. Cooper and Kamran Khan, Washington Post Foreign Service, Monday, August 19 1996; Page A10, *The Washington Post*.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

fomenting stereotypes, and engaging in hatemongering and fear-mongering.

However, the art must have been more to the taste of University of Maryland officials. The students were not called to account for their smear. On today's campus, some forms of hate speech are entirely acceptable.

The "potential rapists" lists also shows how divided feminism is over stereotypes and man-bashing. Some feminists condemn the list -- of course, not strongly enough to require the university to respond. (Feminists had more important things to devote their energies to. When four male students at Cornell used campus computers to *privately* circulate a list of offensive jokes, feminists demanded the men be punished. They were.)

Other feminists are far more ambivalent about the UM "potential rapists" list. Some criticize it as "bad for feminism." They skip over the matter of smearing innocent men, then focus on how the issue might be bad for *women!*

And some feminists ardently support the "potential rapists" list and the sentiments behind it.

In fact, while searching for the background on the "potential rapists" list, we inadvertently set off a long-running Usenet discussion featuring one feminist who absolutely and unequivocally defends the list.

The feminist said: "The girls did good... the quality of their effort is not measured by its common reception, but by its truth and its endurance. ... The fact is women have reason to fear males any place and at any time. ... The women who posted that list of potential rapists were making a valid statement."

Then this feminist, who uses a male name on the Internet, went into a sort of free-association word-salad of images apparently about rape: "as for what the art was illustrative of; any male can be a rapist, a friend, a father, a thug in any guise... walk down a street not knowing who, open the door not knowing who, lay in a hospital bed unconscious, no matter where, when, and by anyone male..."

Many people objected to this feminist's views, trying to get the feminist to acknowledge a problem with smearing innocent men, or to acknowledge that a similar list would be unacceptable if it said that all

Arabs are potential terrorists, all Hispanics are potential illegal aliens, all blacks are potential drug dealers, and so on. The feminist rejected such arguments as "irrelevant."

The feminist also dismissed moral objections to the list. When someone replied, "The question is whether it is an effective statement or ethical statement," the feminist blithely replied: "effective or ethical are matters for another discussion."

So you can smear innocent men, and the ethics of it are for "another discussion."

The feminist saw nothing wrong with taking the fact that some men rape and then labeling all men "potential rapists." "If you disagree, do try to present something other than 'because some of a set are does not mean that all of that set are.'" In other words, the feminist doesn't care if it is an invalid stereotype. One person replied that because some marbles are blue does not mean that all marbles are blue. That makes sense to us. But not to the feminist, who adamantly rejected the argument.

Trying to take the discussion to a higher level of prevention, one man suggested that we "work on methods of identifying assailants before they assault." To this, another feminist replied that it's no problem to identify assailants: "Easy, young men, especially jocks, especially drinking jocks."

Oh, so identifying potential rapists is easy -- just identify "young men."

So, let's also work on methods for identifying potential stereotypers:

Easy. Feminists. Especially self-righteous feminists.⁸⁶

A Feminist Condemns Male-Bashing ... Well, Sort Of

Feminists say they would make better politicians because they are more moral than men, and not as bigoted. Of course, last issues we told you about the diversity director at the Social Security Administration who led off a diversity seminar with a man-bashing joke, so that sort of blows that idea all to hell. But that was then, this is now. So we'd like to show you how one feminist recently condemned man-bashing -- sort of.

It started with a Usenet posting called "male-bashing continues: How do you react?" One man asked other men for their reactions: "I'm going very tired of the con-

tinuous male-bashing that goes on in our society. Everyone is so nice and supportive of females, and if you say one uncomplimentary thing about them everyone thinks you're a 'pig,' yet men are continually ridiculed, told how worthless they are, laughed at, etc.

"I'm very curious how other men feel about this. ... Do you notice it? Do you ignore it? Do you think it's funny? Does it hurt you? Does it make you feel less worthy than women?"

So a feminist responded to him. Watch how she proceeds to do the following:

Step 1) Make some pro forma comments that bashing men is not good.

Step 2) Establish women's perpetual victimhood.

Step 3) Blame men for male-bashing, rather than admitting that some women can aspire to bigotry entirely on their own.

Step 4) Reverse her initial condemnation of man-bashing by concluding that bashing men is a good thing because it teaches them how it feels.

Here's what the feminist said:

"Denigrating any one group of people because they are representative of that group is almost always a form of bigotry, even when it is done in the name of humor."

(Step One accomplished. Pro forma condemnation of bashing is made -- and in just one sentence. (Note how she didn't actually say that bashing MEN is bad, just that bashing "any one group ...")

(The feminist will now ignore the poster's concerns about male-bashing and commence Step Two:)

"When I was a little girl my mother took my sister and I to a town by the sea called Cape May, New Jersey. One day we were shopping and I saw some post cards depicting girls in itty bitty bikinis; next to them was some post cards of older women who were very heavy; they too were wearing bathing suits, but the message on those cards was loud and clear. If you're a young woman you have something [worthwhile], but as you age you are valueless; I didn't see the same type of cards depicting older men."

(Step Two complete, with a bit of animosity thrown in: "I didn't see the same type

of cards depicting older men." Ever notice how many feminists just can't sit still when a man mentions being a target in modern gender warfare? The feminist has to jump in and establish her place as the real victim.)

(Now, begin Step Three of blaming men for male-bashing.)

"Yes, putting men down may be a form of bigotry and it may also be a form of comic relief to women who have felt subjugated and put down as a gender for centuries ..."

(Here at Per's MANifesto, we bet those women who felt that way for *centuries* sure didn't look good in bathing suits, either. But let her continue:)

"I mean, "Why buy the COW if you can get the milk for free", and "God gave women sex organs so that men would talk to them". There is no easy answer to your question because if female bashing is wrong and goes unanswered one has to question the value of male bashing as another form of retort."

(Note the language "if female bashing is wrong" then maybe male-bashing is appropriate.)

"I don't believe that two wrongs make a right (triteness lives) but I do believe that once in a while, one has to "fight fire with fire";"

(So two wrongs *do* make a right if a feminist does it. Now prepare for Step Four, in which a feminist declares the benefits of bashing men.)

"if nothing else, the men who feel bashed now know what it feels like to be disparaged. If you really believe that the male gender is suffering the slings and arrows of "male bashing" in some vacuum, think again."

There you have it: from saying that "Denigrating any one group of people ... is almost always a form of bigotry" to defending man-bashing as a "form of retort" to "fight fire with fire" and let men "know what it feels like."

We certainly are glad for moral feminists like this.

They engage in gender stereotypes, bashing and hatred -- but only for moral, up-standing reasons.⁸⁷

Mothers Give You the Business

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

A feminist recently told us that fathers perpetuate violence by passing it on to their sons.

Never mind that our prisons are full of men who grew up without fathers.

Never mind that street gangs are full of young men who don't have a father at home.

Never mind that growing up without a father is, for boys, linked to higher rates of crime, violence, school dropouts and drug use.

According to the feminist, it's fathers who perpetuate the violence.

No wonder, then, that so many feminists are trying to make sure these brutal, primitive beasts known as "men" don't have anything to do with their children.

You couldn't get away with trying to promote a similar stereotype about mothers. Motherhood is sacred.

Be careful if you try to take a crack at Mother.

And be careful if you take crack *from* Mother.

That's the lesson to be learned from the story of Rayful Edmond III, who became one of the biggest cocaine distributors in the United States.

And he couldn't have done it without mom.

Edmond got his start in drug dealing by holding money for his mother, Constance "Bootsie" Perry, as she sold illegal pills on the streets of Washington, D.C. Later, his father also gave him additional training in the drug business.

But now he has been sentenced to prison for life. And at the Lewisburg, Pa., federal penitentiary he met Dixon Dario Trujillo-Blanco and his brother, Osvaldo. The three men are now accused of running a drug ring from the prison. They hit it off very well because they have something in common: they all got involved in crime and the drug trade because of dear old mom.

Authorities say Rayful Edmond's mother played more of a supporting role in his rise to drug kingpin. Not so for the Trujillo-Blanco brothers. Their mother was a hands-on businesswoman, known for her violence and her deep involvement in the drug business.

The Trujillo-Blanco brothers were introduced to the drug trade by their own mother,

Griselda Blanco, who became known as the "Godmother of Cocaine" for her connections with the notorious and violent Medellin cocaine cartel.

Griselda Blanco was a self-made woman, starting out small, as a pickpocket, and working her way up.

The Washington Post says: "Blanco, who allegedly killed two of her four husbands, turned to her top financial adviser and her favorite hit man to instruct her sons on the distribution and killing ends of her business, (says) Richard Smitten, who wrote a book on Blanco called 'The Godmother.'"

"Bob Palombo, a Drug Enforcement Administration agent who investigated the Blanco organization, said in an interview last week that Griselda Blanco was responsible for much of the drug-related violence in South Florida during the 1980s. She is credited with perfecting the motorcycle assassination, a popular tactic among South Florida's "cocaine cowboys." And she once had a part interest in a Colombian factory that manufactured girdles and bras with compartments to hide cocaine."

They say that behind every successful man is a woman.*

Obviously these women knew how to get their sons cracking.⁸⁸

Nutrition Leader Feeds us a Line

Ellen Haas hasn't reached the same pinnacles of success as Benazir Bhutto. Haas is merely Undersecretary for the Department of Labor. But even from a relatively lesser post, a woman can start thinking big. She can become a mover and shaker.

Well, it appears Haas is *moving* a lot of government money to her friends -- and *shaking* us down in the process.

For the second time in less than half a year, the watchdog General Accounting Office has accused Haas of violating ethics regulations and federal procurement laws and engaging in "a pattern of poor management."

Maybe we should call this "poor womanagement." Don't want to use sexist language.

* (Source: "For Jailed Kingpins, A Cocaine Kinship: Feds Say Friendship Begot Partnership For D.C. Dealer, Colombian Brothers, by Toni Locy, *The Washington Post*, Monday, August 19 1996; Page A01)

Despite two such GAO rulings in five months, Haas merely says that "mistakes" were made and refuses to step down.

Her political allies say the accusations are motivated by politics. We buy that. People usually don't turn in allies. A politically motivated charged has to be looked at carefully, but it's not necessarily unfounded. And GAO investigators have shown evidence indicating that Haas steers government contracts to cronies and political allies.

For example: According to The Washington Post, "the GAO said Haas violated federal ethics standards by allowing Susan Shreve, a close friend of 15 years, to receive a \$25,000 contract from USDA to write a children's book on nutrition."

Haas personally reviewed the book. The author has been paid \$11,250 and planned to sell the government 25,000 copies for \$50,000.

But another official stopped the lucrative deal after noting that the department could have free access to the book after a year and print the book itself.

The GAO also cited Haas for careless management of a \$173,000 contract that mushroomed into a \$2.3 million contract, and also for committing nearly half a million dollars so the department could use two cartoon characters from "The Lion King."

Maybe Haas could star in her own movie.*

Call it "The Good Old Girls Club."⁸⁹

Cosmowatch

Cosmopolitan is a leading women's magazine. Its articles and attitudes run counter to feminist claims that women are oppressed by "the beauty trap," that women are less lustful, unfaithful and materialistic than men, that women are just somehow nicer. Cosmo far outsells Ms. Magazine. And the "Cosmo girl" knows darn well she can get what she wants by selling her sexuality or playing hardball at the office. So what attitudes are women buying when they pick up Cosmo? Here's some items from the October issue:

Articles:

* (Reference: "'Team Nutrition' Leader Again Dines on Crow: Agriculture Official Admits Contract 'Mistakes'" By Bill McAllister, *The Washington Post*, Thursday, September 19 1996; Page A29.)

- "Men *Love* Mysterious Women -- Seven Ways to Become One."
- "What Women Can Learn From Men at Work: Strategies *they* use can earn titles, money, perks for *you!*"
- "Keep *Your* Job -- Even if Nobody *Else* Does"
- "In Hollywood, Even Friends Are Professional: These hangers-on have perfected the art of cozing up!"
- "The Glam (Sexy Too!) World of Political Volunteers: Want to meet some *good* men? Mingle with Hollywood's Hottest? It's *possible* if you join ..."
- "Getting Out of a Psychologically Abusive Relationship."[†]
- "He Might Sit Up and Notice if You ..."

(This is a list of ways to get a man's attention. They include:)

- ... Shine a flashlight in his eyes whenever he stops listening.
- ... Tell him you have a crush on the doorman.
- ... Take lessons at a pistol-firing range.
- ... Shave your pubic hair or have it waxed into the shape of a heart.
- ... Call him the wrong name while making love.
- ... Read aloud from an article on penile implants.
- ... Run over his favorite guitar.
- ... Ask for a divorce.

Cartoon:

- Two women in a bar. One says: "His work keeps him away from home most of the time. I like that in a husband."⁹⁰

Humor:

Per's MANifesto newsletter announcements:

The Honest Feminist Contest

Diogenes took his lamp and went looking for an honest man.

Now it's the feminists' turn.

[†] (Among the "abuse" topics it covers are being in a relation with someone who criticizes, withholds love, wants you to change, or wants more. If this is abuse, then the number of abused men just skyrocketed. The article recommends: "don't trust your lover too much," and says that "the most important question in any relationship (is) 'How does this man make me feel?'"

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

We're picking up our flashlight and going in search of an honest feminist. And believe me, we're bringing extra batteries.

In keeping with the theme of this month's MANifesto, we're looking for this high moral character that feminists say they bring to public life. We're looking for a feminist who will admit it is gender discrimination when a man is denied a job because he is a man. In other words, she's so honest she won't try to claim that discrimination is equality.*

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that she doesn't call for equality when it's to her disadvantage. If the courts are biased in her favor in a child custody dispute, she'll admit that she's not going to demand equality and a level playing field.

We're looking for a feminist so honest that she'll admit that protecting only female workers from offensive language is a special protection and not equality.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that it's censorship to censor offensive speech.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that censoring only the offensive speech of men is not the equality they claim to support.

We're looking for a feminist who'll admit that women living an average of seven years longer than men does NOT mean that women's health is being "shortchanged."

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that the feminist rallying cry of "all men are potential rapists" is an anti-male stereotype. She won't try to play semantics or abstract word games in order to ignore the hate message those words can convey.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that feminism bears responsibility for the innocent lives that have been destroyed by fads, pseudo-science and hysteria promoted by feminism. She'll admit that feminism has destroyed innocent people by promoting hysteria over "Satanic cults" in day care centers, in promoting the false accusations arising from the so-called "Recovered

Memory Therapy," in trumped-up rape charges based on the idea that it's "date rape" if a woman regrets having sex after the fact, and so on.

And we're looking for feminists who will admit that movies portraying men as scum and justifying just about any female revenge against them are man-bashing movies.

So we're calling on all MANifesto readers. Pick up your flashlights and go looking for an honest feminist. If you find one, nominate her for the Per's MANifesto Honest Feminist Contest.

The grand prize for the best entry is ... taa-daaa ... well, there ain't one.

At least we're honest.

And the deadline is ... well, there ain't one, either.

We figure you'll need lots of time.

Message your entries to PerAddress@gnn.com with the subject line "Honest Feminist Contest."

And one good thing about looking for an honest feminist.

It's not likely to take up much bandwidth.⁹¹

You Might be a Male Feminist If ...

... you've ever gone to a "Take Back The Night" march with a condom in your wallet.

... you're willing to sacrifice jobs, safety, security, rights, promotions and pay raises -- of any other man except you.

... you've ever told her that "all men are potential rapists" hoping that she'll be afraid to date anyone but you.

... you've posted anonymously: "submissive male seeks strong woman for instruction in discipline ..."

... you hope your ability to quote chapter and verse from "The Beauty Trap" will impress the really hot babes.

... you hope that your staunch support for Affirmative Action and hiring quotas means that they'll never be applied against YOU.

... you set up a "safe and nurturing environment," a support group, or a retreat to shelter "strong women."

... you think that violence is always wrong -- and you'll shoot any man who disagrees.

... you think at embracing and preaching anti-male stereotypes means you'll be exempt from them.

... you believe that a man yelling at a woman constitutes domestic violence, while a woman stabbing a man is a firm stand against domestic violence.

* (*The fine print: It doesn't count if she basically admits a point and then fudges it all to heck. In other words, she can't admit it's discrimination to deny a man a job because he's a man and then fudge it all over the place by claim this discrimination brings about equality. Fudging is not honest. No points for fudging.)

And here are some from "mew."

... you think that the woman who fired you can't be sexist because women have no power in today's society.

... you admonish your children to "look before you leap" but you feel guilty for leaving the toilet seat up.

... you set out the trash for the garbage men before going to work to meet with a chairperson.

... you've ever referred to _yourself_ as "draftsperson", "chairperson", etc.

... you think of your newborn son as a potential rapist.

... you think it's normal genetics that so many first-born children bear no resemblance to their fathers.

... you agree with the widow next door that women's health issues are underfunded.

And Aric contributes these:

... you think it unfair that women have to pay more for clothes, especially since they live longer so they have to buy more.

... you feel women should band together to "take back the net" starting with the elimination of male-oppressive sexual jargon like "hard drive" and "motherboard".⁹²

... being vilified for things that you never ever did seems natural and right to you.⁹³

POW says Dead men are Healthier

Dead men are healthier than most women, says a new study released by the Propaganda Organization for Women (POW).

"We've long known that women are being shortchanged on health care," says Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of POW. "Now this report proves it."

"Statistics show that women live about seven years longer than men," she said. "Thus women live long enough to suffer a variety of ailments that men never have to suffer. Consider the scourge of osteoporosis -- the brittle-bone disease that occurs in older people. Most victims of this disease are women. That's because they live long enough to get it. Men don't live as long as women, so they don't suffer as much osteoporosis. Obviously, if fewer men are suffering from this insidious and debilitating disease, then men are healthier than women."

"Also, we have found that many widows have a tough time getting by on the pensions of their late husbands. These widows cannot always afford the finest health care. This

causes them to suffer from a variety of ailments their late husbands are not forced to endure."

"Some people ask us -- 'what should be done about men dying earlier than women?' We say that obviously it means we have to put more money into improving the health of women. After all, it doesn't make any sense to spend our scarce health-care dollars on dead people."

"Some backslathers point out that men have higher rates of depression, alcoholism and drug abuse. 'Isn't that a health issue?' they say. We don't think so. After all, many of the men who have alcoholism or addictions will go on to commit suicide. Once you're dead, obviously you aren't suffering from a disease anymore."

"Meanwhile there are all these living women who suffer from depression. It is our job to help the living."

"Also, suicide is a personal choice. This is one area in which feminists will defend a man's right to choose."

"We also found that dead men are healthier in one other key area. In strict, laboratory conditions, we scanned the brain waves of a random sampling of dead men. For a control group, we then scanned the brain waves of a random sampling of members of our feminist group."

"The dead men scored higher in every respect."⁹⁴

OCTOBER 1996

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of MANifesto where we take a look at the problem of being "Male And Presumed Guilty." [...]

* First, we're pleased to tell you that MANifesto is now available on the web, and this site also offers a few back issues.

(More will be archived as we go along.) See <http://members.gnn.com/peraddress/manifest.htm>. Also available:

The POW Page, featuring some of our most popular satires on feminist extremism. Read up on Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname and her Propaganda Organization for Women at <http://members.gnn.com/peraddress/powpage.htm>

And a brand new page, Mondo Feminism, News From the Weird Side. Heard of the sports fans who raped a doll? A giant eunuch Jesus? Gloria Steinem getting down with

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

In this issues, we examine several court cases where men apparently are presumed guilty until proven innocent. Sometimes the injustice can be rectified, sometimes not. But all of these cases involve men who went before our supposedly blind system of justice and found themselves "male and presumed guilty."

Male and Presumed Guilty, Part I

Troy Lynn Webb, 29, spent seven years in jail. He was sentenced to serve 47 years.

But the state of Virginia pardoned and released Mr. Webb earlier this month after admitting that he was wrongfully convicted of rape. Mr. Webb and his family family had contacted The Innocence Project, an organization that helps with DNA testing for people wrongfully imprisoned. The test cleared him as a suspect.

Mr. Webb's case is worth noting for several reasons. One, his victim identified him as the attacker. And serology tests available at the time of his trial could not rule him out.

But "genetic fingerprint" tests are more conclusive and sophisticated. They showed that victims can make mistakes, and even misidentify and innocent man. Governor George Allen said Mr. Webb would not have been convicted if the tests had been available during his trial.

Seven years is a long time for an innocent person to spend in jail. But the consequences could have been worse. In today's overheated, emotionally charged atmosphere, California has passed a law calling for the chemical or even physical castration of child molesters. This law way originally sponsored by feminists who admit that their aim is to have the law applied to men convicted of rape as well. The Associated Press reports that the California law "was drawn up by Susan Carpenter-McMillan, executive director of the Pasadena-based Women's Coalition. The women originally wanted the bill to apply to all rapists but settled for the more narrow bill as a good first step. 'If this doesn't pass, we'll bring it back again and again and again,' Carpenter-McMillan said. 'We're not talking about cutting off their testicles. Maybe someday, but not now.' "

We are glad that Mr. Webb, an innocent man, has been freed. It is bad enough that he lost seven years of his life -- seven years the state cannot give back. It should be a lesson to us that mistakes can be made. And it should sound a cautionary note against barbaric forms of vengeance that cannot be reversed.⁹⁵

Male and Presumed Guilty, Part II

In a similar case, Wayne Dumond of Arkansas was convicted of raping a woman in 1984. That woman also identified him as the attacker. And now, DNA tests on the sperm found in her pants indicates he is innocent, and Governor Mike Huckabee says he intends to commute the sentence.

But another, far more barbaric sentence has already been carried out. While Dumond was awaiting trial, two masked men broke into his home and castrated him.

Then a St. Francis County sheriff preserved the severed testicles in formaldehyde and put them on display on his desk.

Dumond won a \$110,000 lawsuit over this Medieval display. The guilty sheriff later was sent to jail on an unrelated racketeering charge.

Based on the DNA evidence, a parole board recommended that Dumond be released from prison.

That was in 1990.⁹⁶

Male and Presumed Guilty, Part III

Jon Feeney of Missouri is on trial. The official charge is that he murdered his family.

But the more you read about the case, the more it looks like he is on trial because he is a man.

Feeney says he was 90 miles away from his home in Springfield, attending a teachers' conference at the Lake of the Ozarks the night his wife, son, and daughter were killed. The assistant prosecutor admits that no witness puts Feeney in Springfield on the night of the slayings. No physical evidence has been presented linking him to the crime scene.

Prosecutors admit it is a weak case. We wonder if a woman would be put on trial, or even fall under suspicion, in similar circumstances. But the attitude seems to be that Feeney is a man, dammit, so he has to be

guilty. Consider how they went about indicting him.

Central to the indictment was the testimony of a convenience-store clerk named Ron Gann. Mr. Gann said that he sold gasoline to a man he thought resembled Feeney early on the morning of the slayings. He also said he remembered Feeney's red Mustang convertible.

That's slim, indeed. And his story was riddled with inconsistencies when he told various versions in depositions, interviews and testimony. But never mind, it was good enough for the state. They put Feeney on trial. They're asking for the death penalty.

However, a defense attorney discovered something interesting. Time sheets show that Gann, the convenience-store clerk, was not even working at the time he "remembers" seeing Mr. Feeney.

The state's case was not very good to begin with. Now it has gotten weaker. But rather than drop the charges, the state is going ahead with the trial.

And they're still seeking the death penalty.⁹⁷

Male and Presumed Guilty, Part IV

David M. Nevers, who contributes to the soc.men discussion group, saw for himself a "Male and Presumed Guilty" attitude in the court system. His wife had attacked him, sending him to the emergency room four times. Yet in court after one of the attacks, the judge assumed that David was the attacker. Here is the story in his own words:

My ex-wife stood before the criminal court judge, charged with Domestic Battery (after my third trip to the emergency room). The judge, a woman, was listening to the Asst. State's Attorney, another woman, explaining to the judge what the Complaint was all about. The State's Attorney kept referring to me as "the Defendant." Why? Because I was a man, and it was a Domestic Violence case. All domestic violence is committed by men, right?

The judge began to read me the riot act about my superior strength, my size, etc. I had to interrupt at that point and tell these two women (Judge and State's Attorney) that had already indicted and convicted me based on my gender, that I was there as the VICTIM, not "the Defendant." I was the one sent to the hospital, the one they were supposed to be protecting.

When the judge found out it was a woman charged with a violent crime, her demeanor changed. There were no lectures, no warnings, just a business-like disposition of the case.

Oh, and when the court was routinely handing out Protection Orders to any woman who asked for one, my request was denied. The judge said I "look like I can take care of myself."

By the way, my ex pled guilty to the charge in exchange for probation and no jail time. While on probation, she broke my nose. The judge denied the request for revocation of her probation.

(But David's problems with the courts were far from over. Though his wife had not spent any time in jail, David found himself there in a dispute over splitting up their property. He continues:)

For those of you who don't know my story, I was divorced last year in DuPage County, IL. The presiding judge, Robert Byrne, said that my ex-wife's domestic violence (I was in the ER four times) was not a "relevant factor" in child custody cases, and awarded sole custody to her.

During the divorce I was stitched up when she kicked me through a glass storm door, then I got second degree burns when she slammed an oven door on my arm and held it shut. Ten days later, she threw me down a flight of stairs. This time, after the ER doctor insisted, the police arrested her, and she pled guilty to battery. Later, after Judge Byrne made his remarkable finding of sole custody to the abuser, she broke my nose with a picture frame she wanted (but didn't get) in the settlement. The police refused to press charges.

I was ordered out of the house in 10 days, and she was awarded 60% of the equity. Nice reward for criminal conduct, eh? She is supposed to pay me my share of the equity, but she wants a deed turned over BEFORE she does so.

The "new" judge on our divorce case today said I willfully violated the court order by not signing over the deed to the house (even without her payment to me).

When I continued to refuse to sign it, the sheriff took me into custody. I was frisked, my belt, tie, and personal belongings removed from my pockets. I was handcuffed, and led down to the DuPage County criminal lockup.

Originally, the judge said I was to be booked and then brought back to court in an inmate uniform, to continue the other issues up before the court.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

At 3:30pm (two hours after my "arrest") the judge sent word down that he was "going home for the day" and unless and until I signed the deed I could rot in jail.

(Note: As a civil "violin" I was not entitled to the usual criminal procedural things. I could not speak to my attorney, get out on bail, get a speedy trial, etc. About all I was allowed was the right to make a collect call. Oh, and they did agree to give me a cup of hot tea after 4 hours in the lockup. The concept is that jail is used as civil coercion to force a course of action, as opposed to jail used as a punishment for a previous (criminal) action.)

I signed it at 4:30pm, with the notation - UNDER DURESS - next to my signature.

The only criminal in this case has yet to see the inside of a jail cell. My ex wife has pled guilty to battery, and been convicted twice of criminal contempt of court, and she remains free, with sole custody of my children, and now, the deed to my home.⁹⁸

- David M. Nevers*

Male and Presumed Guilty, Part V

Charlie Minor was no Boy Scout. He succeeded in the often-sleazy world of record promoters -- a world of fast women, cocaine, connections, and maybe some special favors for the radio personalities who play your client's music.

Charlie Minor was good at it. Janet Jackson, Sting, Bryan Adams and Amy Grant are among the stars who credit him with helping them gain big hits.

Charlie had a lot of money. And he attracted a lot of women. But on March 19, 1995, a jilted former lover shot him to death, with nine soft-point bullets.

The killer, Suzette McClure, is a thirty-year-old stripper.

And McClure's defense team makes no secret that they plan to put the murder victim on trial, painting her as a naive waif and men in general as the real culprits. They are going to make McClure into a female O.J. Simpson, playing the gender card instead of the race card.

The defense is going to try to convince the jury that McClure is an unsophisticated California Valley Girl who somehow got caught up in the fast lane. They will try to paint her as a good girl misled by men. The defense calls McClure "a good girl pushed beyond her limits ... She is Catholic ... and

not used to people who lie all the time." The defense is going to come down to the argument that Charlie Minor's murder was his own fault, that he got what he deserved.

We hope the jury sees through this portrait of a sweet, innocent little killer.

Long before she met Charlie Minor, Suzette McClure had taken up stripping, because the money was good. It helped support her L.A. lifestyle of beaches, parties, and hanging around with celebrities and music executives.

The defense will try to make it look as though she somehow got accidentally pulled into the fast lane, that she was a pious, trusting soul who unsuspectingly wound up with a player like Charlie Minor. But if McClure was so unsophisticated and pious, she could have found an unsophisticated, pious man. She didn't. She hung out in strip clubs and dated men with the money, the juice. Charlie Minor didn't turn McClure into a stripper. She already was one.

When he dumped her, she got a gun. The defense will tell you it was heartbreak. So what was her heart broken over? Losing a lover? or losing the hot cars, luxurious oceanfront house, fast life and big money that went with him?

Nancy Kaser Boyd, a Los Angeles psychologist who is helping the defense, says: "Women kill because their self-esteem has been destroyed. The real culprits here are the men who run the record industry."

Real culprits? We thought that killing people made you a "real culprit."

If this sort of defense works, then what's to stop anyone from using it? Why not say that men kill because their self-esteem is destroyed, and that women are the "real culprits"? Do we want to go down this road? Because if we do, then let's go down it equally.

The Suzette McClure trial should be watched closely. What the defense is trying to pull off is the argument that men who are killed deserve it, that women who kill really are driven to it.

(McClure's case gets a sympathetic write-up in the November 1996 issue of the women's magazine *Cosmopolitan*.)⁹⁹

The Justice and Johnathan

* See at: <dmnevers@ix.netcom.com>

Lorraine Miller is a judge. She handles criminal cases for New York's state Supreme Court.

So it probably would be a good idea if a person entrusted with that sort of power did not go around harassing and smearing people. But Justice Miller had her own ideas of justice.

The state recently punished her for carrying out a campaign against a former lover. It found that she had sent "anonymous, harassing and offensive" mailings against a man who broke off a relationship with her.

The man, S. Barrett Hickman, broke off with Miller in 1992 when he met another woman, whom he later married. Hickman told the New York Post that Miller stalked him, even following him to South Africa once. He says she also canceled his credit cards. A commission investigating the judge says she got confidential divorce records on Mr. Hickman's wife and sent the information to neighbors and friends of the couple, and to the newspapers and businesses.

What punishment do you think a male judge would have gotten for this. Removal from the bench? Disbarment.

The state Commission on Judicial Conduct decided merely to "censure" Justice Miller.

Justice Lorraine Miller's punishment was, essentially, a scolding.

Well, at least she got some punishment. In today's movies ("The First Wives Club," "Waiting to Exhale," etc.) this type of behavior isn't condemned -- it's glorified. But don't worry. Those movies never give anybody any ideas, do they?

Justice Miller's case makes an interesting contrast to the punishment meted out to Johnathan Prevette. Johnathan is the six-year-old boy who made national headlines when he was suspended from first grade in Lexington, North Carolina, because he kissed a girl on the cheek.

A boy kisses a girl and gets suspended. A judge harasses a man and merely gets a lecture. In a way, little Johnathan should feel honored. He is being held far more responsible for his actions than is an adult judge!

In our justice system, it's a bigger offense to kiss someone than to harass them.

Or maybe it's just a bigger crime to be male.¹⁰⁰

Where are These Strong Women?

In a recent discussion, a feminist said that people who disagree with feminists just can't handle "strong women."

Well, where are these strong women?

Are they the ones who demand federal protection from jokes?

Are they the ones who demand "a safe and nurturing environment"?

These strong women we are afraid of -- are they the ones who demand separate schools for girls so they won't have to compete with boys, and separate, fully funded female sports leagues where they don't have to compete against men?

These strong women we are so afraid of -- are they the ones who say they are "abused" if their husbands ignore them, walk out of the room silently, or comment on their weight? Are they the ones who say they are being "raped" if men are admitted to their women-only colleges? Are they the ones who accuse a reporter of "battering" them when he questions their statistics?

Are these the strong women we keep hearing about?

These strong women that cause us to tremble so -- are they the ones who demand federal protection from unwanted sexual advances?

I have heard of strong women. Clara Barton was a strong woman. Once, when she was out on a battlefield, a bullet passed through her sleeve and killed the man she was treating. Clara Barton was a strong woman. She was not cowering behind a locked door with the "Take Back The Night" crowd, wailing that she can't walk across a well-patrolled campus for fear of being raped. Clara Barton was out in the world, doing. And she helped men.

Mother Theresa is a strong woman. Instead of looking at the boardrooms and demanding a quota seat, she looked at the slums and asked how she could help. Instead of looking at the wealthiest one percent and saying "I can have it all," she looked at those less fortunate and said they deserve better. She is out in the world helping women ... and men.

They are strong women. Why in the world should we be afraid of them? But they are not the "strong women" to which you refer.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

The strong women you say we fear are the women who cannot compete unless they have special programs, special rights, special classes, special privileges and special protections.

These privileged and protected women are the strong women we are supposedly afraid of.

The "strong women" of feminism have to blame men for all of their own failings, shortcomings. They have to trace all their own crime and immorality back to a man they can blame. These strong women of feminism have to blame men for the fact that throughout history women have sought safety and security rather than the uncertainties of the uncharted land -- that they have sought out men who would provide them with wealth rather than risking the hard, dangerous labor that creates such wealth.

Where are strong women? They're certainly not the ones hiding behind feminism.¹⁰¹

Cosmowatch

Cosmopolitan is a leading women's magazine. Its articles and attitudes run counter to feminist claims that women are oppressed by "the beauty trap," that women are less lustful, unfaithful and materialistic than men, that women are just somehow nicer. Cosmo far outsells Ms. Magazine. And the "Cosmo girl" knows darn well she can get what she wants by selling her sexuality or playing hardball at the office. So what attitudes are women buying when they pick up Cosmo? Here's some items from the November 1996 issue:

- "The Cosmo Great Body Guide."
- "The Secret Voyeur in All of Us: If visual cues turn you on, go ahead and peek."
- "Do You Remember When You Last Made Love?"

This article on page 112 makes an interesting comparison to an article on page 86 of the same issue: "My Husband is a Sex Addict." So if the Cosmo Girl isn't getting enough sex, it's serious. But if the husband wants more, he's a "sex maniac."

- "Fashion: The New Ski Chic."
- "The Simply Sexy Black Dress."

A sympathetic look at Suzette McClure, a woman who killed a man who jilted her. (See "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part V," above. Read all about a supposedly naive young waif being dragged down by powerful men. Then turn to page 260 and read all about how glamorous it is to date rich, corrupt men, with an excerpt from the novel "The Last Don": "He's super rich, a Godfather-to-be, and powerless over his love for luminous movie star Athena Aquitane."¹⁰²

The Honest Feminist Contest – Continued

Last issue, we invited people to send us nominations for the Honest Feminist Contest.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit it is gender discrimination when a man is denied a job because he is a man. She won't try to claim that discrimination is equality.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that she never calls for equality when it's to her disadvantage.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that censoring only the offensive speech of men is not the equality they claim to support.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit that feminism bears responsibility for tearing families apart by saying fathers are unnecessary except for a monthly check and by poisoning children against their dads.

We're looking for a feminist who will admit feminism bears responsibility for the innocent lives destroyed by fads, pseudo-science and hysteria promoted by feminism. She'll admit that feminism has destroyed innocent people by promoting hysteria over "Satanic cults" in day care centers, in promoting the false accusations arising from the so-called "Recovered Memory Therapy," in trumped-up rape charges based on the idea that it's "date rape" if a woman regrets having sex after the fact, and so on.

Like Diogenes taking up his lamp to look for an honest man, we've picked up our flashlight and gone searching for an honest feminist -- and believe me, we brought extra batteries.

The nominations for Honest Feminists have not exactly been rolling in.

Big surprise there, eh?

The big news is that we actually had a winner -- sort of. We got a feminist who didn't

fudge all that much. But before we present The Winnah, we're going to sift through all the runners up, because they're so much more fun. And believe me, none of the runners up was awarded "Miss Congeniality."

The nominations for Honest Feminist were going pretty slow until we finally got serious nomination. But it was for a woman who has long since left the feminist discussion groups.

Hmm. So the one honest feminist left the feminist discussion groups? Tell you something, don't it?

Also nominated was the person who goes by the name of Guerrilla Grrrl. Ms. Grrrl posted under the subject line of "We Will Crush You!" Her message was "Yes, Feminism will crush you, bozos! Ha hah ah ah!"

Well, that certainly was honest.

In fact, it's so honest that we suspect that the folks down at the Womyn's Center are mighty upset with dear Ms. Grrrl for being far too direct. We suspect that Ms. Grrrl is now getting a crash course in FeministSpeak, where she will learn to say "diversity" instead of "quotas," "heteropatriarchy" instead of "those bastards" and "the best interest of the child" instead of "screw fathers."

We are confident that, with the proper training, Ms. Grrrl will become like most feminists, and soon begin telling us that discrimination is equality, that bias is fairness, and that punishing only men is equal protection under the law.

Then there was the feminist who spoke in regard to false or skewed feminist statistics. She said:

"Let's look at it in the scheme of things; we live in a country that's run by a president who has lied, several members of congress who have lied, and both political parties which have lied, lied, lied; are you really that upset over a few faulty statistics? Get a grip!"

Hey, why should we be upset about a few "faulty" statistics, eh? Just because they held send innocent people to jail, tear families apart, stereotype men, fuel the hysteria over "Satanic cults" in day-care centers and generally reinforce the concept of "Male and Presumed Guilty" — other than that, what harm can come of them?

While waiting like the Maytag Repairman for the Honest Feminist nominations to roll in, we happened to go looking for the full text of a statement once made by Robin Morgan, who had been editor of Ms. Magazine. The quote, as it turned out, was this. Morgan said "man-hating is an honorable and viable political act, that the oppressed have a right to class-hatred against the class that is oppressing them."

Robin Morgan's man-hating quote led us to all sorts of feminists who bombed out in the Honest Feminist category. After we put out a Usenet request for the full Morgan quote, a feminist named Kay sarcastically responded: "Hey, you out there, do my research for me! ... My, but the bigots are lazy today."

So when you research feminist bigotry -- that makes you a bigot! But Kay, don't you think Ms. Morgan's quote shows a bit of bigotry? And Kay, remember, Morgan also said the following: "I haven't the faintest notion what possible revolutionary role white heterosexual men could fulfill, since they are the very embodiment of reactionary-vested-interest-power. But then, I have great difficulty examining what men in general could possibly do about all this. In addition to doing the shitwork that women have been doing for generations, possibly not exist? No, I really don't mean that. Yes, I really do."

"Possibly not exist"?

So Kay, do you see any bigotry in those comments?

(Well, dear reader, get ready for Kay's answer. It once again buries the needle on the feminist hypocrisy meter.)

Asked if there is any bigotry in Morgan's words, Kay replies:

"No, Robin Morgan's words strike me as angry. Look at the stuff posted on this newsgroup; really read it. Then read Morgan's words again. How mild her tone is compared to the rest. She's only angry at people who try to hurt and oppress her. Men can take themselves out of that category if they want to do so. Or they can make excuses for themselves."

So a feminist's tone is "mild" even when she talks about men ceasing to exist. According to Kay, it's bigotry to research femi-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

nist prejudice, but not bigotry when a feminist says man-hating is valid.

Not content with mere double-standards, Kay actually invents fanciful interpretations of Morgan's words. "She's only angry at people who try to hurt and oppress her." Readers, did you see any such qualification in Morgan's quote?

Kay says "Men can take themselves out of that category if they want to do so. Or they can make excuses for themselves."

We are certainly glad the *targets* of bigotry can always remove themselves from the bigots' scorn and thus avoid any Final Solutions. Now why don't all those other groups that draw a bigot's wrath just wise up and realize they can take themselves "out of that category"?

So you can see why looking for an Honest Feminist is such a chore. We've got a feminist here who can't even admit that hating men is a form of bigotry. How can we expect fairness and integrity from feminists who will not acknowledge that hating men is a form of bigotry?

Several feminists tried to convince us that Ms. Morgan's statements about man-hating were not about man-hating. One of the most interesting examples came from someone who used a fake email address. (Hmm -- not off to a good start on honesty issues.) Referring to Ms. Morgan's "possibly not exist" comment about men, this feminist said:

"Dear Per, you err or mislead. She did not say she wished men ceased to exist. Those were YOUR words. As you quoted, she said, "Possibly not exist" and this referred only a select group of men ("white heterosexual men") in a specific role ("revolutionary role"), that such a class of men, representing, "embod[ing], "reactionary-vested-interest-power" would cease to exist, and you quoted it as a question and now pretend it was a statement. Even in her question she did not refer to all men. YOU are either misreading the quote you chose or you are misrepresenting it. I suspect the latter."

Yep. And Hitler thought other groups could help rebuild Germany by possibly not existing, too. (And they wonder where the phrase "feminazis" comes from.) But to set the record straight, you can refer back to the quote and see that Ms. Morgan aim these sentiments specifically at "men in general."

Then she says:

"Where did anyone advocate "man-hating" except for you? Certain men, certain classes, certain behaviors... only you came up with "man-hating" that I have seen here."

If this were a web page, you could just link right back to the man-hating quote that these feminists don't want to acknowledge. And you would see that Morgan said "man-hating is an honorable and viable political act, that the oppressed have a right to class-hated against the class that is oppressing them."

And besides, we're modest. We have to admit that it's not a case that "only you came up with man-hating." No-sirree, we couldn't have done it without feminists like Robin Morgan.

But the feminist we were conversing with then went on to say:

"I did not claim Ms. Morgan wished for men to cease to exist ... She didn't "wish" anything, let alone that."

What Ms. Morgan said, of course, was: "But then, I have great difficulty examining what men in general could possibly do about all this. In addition to doing the shitwork that women have been doing for generations, possibly not exist? No, I really don't mean that. Yes, I really do." The person doing the wishing here is the feminist. She wishes we wouldn't notice the really anti-male biases held by some leading feminist.

And then the feminist went on to say: "only the rarest and most extremes of feminism advocate "man-hating."

We guess that makes the editor of Ms. Magazine "rare."

Unfortunately, feminists of this stripe are not rare. That's what makes the Honest Feminist Contest such a labor -- but it's a labor of love.

Here's our open invitation: If you encounter an honest feminist, take a moment until the shock wears off, and then nominate her for MANifesto's Honest Feminist Contest, via e-mail to PerAddress@gnn.com.

And here's what we'll do.

We'll gather the names of all the honest feminists into one list and send them out to every point on the Usenet.

And it still won't be Spam.

It would just be baloney.¹⁰³

You Might be a Male Feminist If ...

... you think that self-improvement for men means striving to be more like women. (thanks to Derek H.)¹⁰⁴

Affirmative Action for Chess

Do we need affirmative action to help boys play chess?

I think so, at least if we look at what feminists say about television and movies.

Feminists say there aren't enough positive role models for girls in today's entertainment. This contributes to girls' lower self-esteem and sends them negative messages that girls are helpless -- so the feminists say. Girls don't learn to drive trucks or fly spaceships because the movies don't show them doing it, feminists say. And they want to bridge this gap by demanding more positive depictions of girls and women -- even when they have to invent them out of whole cloth.

Well, I've been looking at the game of chess, and I've realized how biased it is against boys. Chess contains so many negative messages for boys, so many bad examples, that it is amazing any boy can still function after being exposed to this game.

First off, the strongest character is the Queen, and the weakest characters are men. The weakest, least valuable chess *men* are called "pawns." It sets a terrible example that we value these male figures so little and that we consider them so disposable.

Two other male figures are the "Knight" and the "Bishop." They mirror society's attempt to trap men in rigid and repressive roles. The Knight is trapped by chivalry -- the spirit of sacrificing himself for others. He can only move in an "L" shaped pattern. This suggests that, despite his forced commitment to chivalry, he really just wants to get the L out of there.

The Bishop is trapped by a patriarchal religion that demands he be "too good for his own good," as feminists are wont to say. Plus, he has to wear a funny hat.

Of course the "Rook" is not much better. What kind of positive role model is dedicated to cheating?

Then there is the Queen. The most powerful figure on the board is female. It is obvious to us that most of the self-esteem prob-

lems suffered by males in chess classes is due to the lack of a strong male figure. To fix this will require exactly \$600,000 of federal funding for seed money to establish a new bureaucracy that I can direct, so that I can move up to Volvo-and-Gucci territory ... I mean, so that society can correct this shameful, disgraceful shame.

And just look at the higher mobility of the Queen. Obviously she is not tied down anywhere and is capable of leaving any of the males behind. Moreover, the Queen is capable of going off in virtually any direction without warning -- sort of like feminist logic.

And the worst part of chess is the pathetic male figure of the "King." The King hides behind other characters and always flees from danger. The example of this timid, fearful male figure instills in boys a sense of "learned helplessness."

And you know what that means ...

It means my seed money will have to go up by another \$100,000 or so.¹⁰⁵

NOVEMBER 1996

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue we'll call "The Book of (Women's) Virtues." Men have taken a lot of bashing lately, mostly from feminists who never were in positions of authority and yet felt themselves qualified to criticize men. But increasingly, women are gaining power. We take a look at how they handle it. And even for those everyday women who may not have extraordinary power, how do they handle ethical dilemmas? Are they intrinsically more moral than men, as feminists would have us believe?

In taking a look at offenses committed by women, we always run the risk of being accused of "bashing" women. Our response is that if it's bashing to discuss women's corruption or abuse of power, then surely it's bashing to do the same to men. So why does feminism do it? And why is it supposed to be enlightening for feminists to constantly criticize men?

We believe that men and women should have equal rights, and equal responsibilities, that they should equally be held responsible for their actions. If that is "backlashing," then it puts feminism in the awkward posi-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

tion of condemning equality in favor of different treatment for the sexes.

We believe that society will be crippled if the gender wars rage out of control. So as a first step toward calling a truce, we ask: "Are men all that bad? Are they the only ones who sin?" We have to get rid of the concept that evil is something essentially male. Let's do that now -- in the interest of getting along.

Women Make Better Bosses

The next time you hear a feminist claim that women make better bosses, tell 'em "Let's ask Rodney Chappel."

Mr. Chappel was a farmhand at the Centerville, Pennsylvania, dairy farm of Barbara See. Ms. See, 50, is one of the local power elite, being the daughter of a wealthy landowner. Mr. Chappel, on the other hand, is a former special education student and is charitably described as a "slow-talking" man.

So what did Barbara See do with the power entrusted to her?

She abused that power -- and Rodney Chappel -- so badly that she is going to jail.

Barbara See was convicted of having Mr. Chappel "disciplined" so severely that, according to testimony, he had broken ribs and a bruised heart. He testified that he was beaten and burned, and that the bludgeoning he took to the head was so severe that his ears are misshapen.

Prosecutors also wanted her charged with keeping Mr. Chappel on her farm against his will, but those charges were dropped for lack of evidence.

Judge Anthony Vardaro said: "Testimony indicates there was a systematic effort to discipline Mr. Chappel in a physical way. ... There was repeated injury to him and repeated harm to him. He was a particularly vulnerable victim, and what they did was particularly cruel."

Also charged along with See is another farmhand. It appears that Ms. See ordered him to take part in her efforts to discipline Mr. Chappel. What this demonstrates is that women can have violent aims and desires as strong as any man -- but they often need a male proxy to help them carry it out.

Who said that if we put women in charge, we would do away with war? Women like

this have no trouble sending men off to do their violent dirty work.

One interesting facet of the case, though, is that both Barbara See and her "assistant" received the same sentence: 11 to 24 months on reckless endangerment charges.

It's interesting that when a man and a woman are charged with a crime, officials often assume that the man is the "ringleader." Apparently it's harder for a woman to argue that she is just a follower when she is the one signing the paychecks of the goons.

Still, we think she deserves greater recognition for her accomplishments as The Boss. She was, after all, giving the orders.¹⁰⁶

Shake Your Bhutto

Benazir Bhutto ran from prime minister of Pakistan with a vow to fight corruption in government.

On Nov. 5, she was thrown out of office, charged with massive corruption, political violence, and financial mismanagement.

It was the second time she was kicked out of that office on corruption charges.

Western feminists loved Bhutto, apparently on the premise that any woman in power is a good thing and a benefit to society. And Bhutto certainly played to that crowd, trying to paint herself as a woman dedicated to modernizing her Moslem nation.

Despite the feminist rhetoric, Bhutto's regime pretty much disproved all the supposed benefits of having a nation ruled by someone suffering from "testosterone poisoning." For instance, Western feminists like to paint themselves as the allies and defenders of ethnic minorities. But there have been about 2,000 murders in Karachi, Pakistan over the last several years, and many victims were members of ethnic minorities critical of Bhutto and her regime.

Some of the corruption charges aimed at Bhutto are doubtlessly politically motivated. International business leaders rate Pakistan as one of the most corrupt nation on earth, second only to Nigeria. Bhutto isn't the first corrupt leader there, and she won't be the last.

But we cannot expect real equality between the sexes until feminists stop trying to paint every sin as a male thing, with women as the solution. In Pakistan, the woman in charge proved how equal men and women

are -- she was equally corrupt, equally capable of leading a system that used violence to silence opponents, equally willing to enrich herself at the public's expense.

Ethics knows no gender. We've overcome most of the stereotypes against women. It's time for feminists to stop fomenting stereotypes against men and admit how equal we really are.¹⁰⁷

Not in the Headlines

You've heard of "genital mutilation." It makes headlines -- when it's done to women.

But here at Per's MANifesto, we pride ourselves in telling you about the stories that don't make the front pages or CNN. Things like cutting up a boy's face -- for tradition.

Joyce Moore, 52, of Harlem, New York, has been charged with slashing the face of her six-year-old grandson. The grandfather, Faru Ibeji, also is being sought.

The boy was slashed with a box cutter, needing 120 stitches for three vertical slashes on each cheek. Police say it was done as part of a tradition associated with the Yoruba tribe of Nigeria.

With all the outrage and media exposure being given to women's "genital mutilation," you wonder why this story never made it off the back pages and roundup columns. If there's a big interest in girls being cut up, it seems like society ought to care when it happens to boys.

Or maybe a little rough treatment for boys is just the thing to make sure they grow up all "snip and snails and puppy dog tails."¹⁰⁸

Girls Will Be Girls

Judy K. Strough, 34, thought she could get away with heckling a comic on stage at the Italian Villa Comedy Club near Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

But she didn't like it when the comic, Al Romero, gave her equal treatment.

Responding to her heckling, Romero told her, "Your husband needs to tell you to shut up."

"I'm from Arkansas," Strough shot back.

"Then your husband-brother needs to tell you to shut up," Romero responded.

Strough went up on stage and punched him in the face. She also threw a drink at the audience and was removed kicking from the club.

She was charged with disorderly conduct and public drunkenness. She was also charged with escape -- officers say she slipped out of the handcuffs and made a fast break before they caught her again.

Oh, well. Girls will be girls.¹⁰⁹

Hidden Abuse, Part I

When you go out, you often trust your child to a girl or woman you barely know.

Look at the smiling face of your babysitter. Such a nice young woman. Who could believe anything bad about her?

Well, look again.

There's a new breed of private investigators who specialize in spying on your babysitter -- videotaping what she does to your child when she thinks no one will see her.

The scenes are often shocking -- children abused, slapped, dragged around by their arms, thrown, or allowed to wander away. Some of the abused kids were as young as six months.

Of course these can only be isolated incidents, right? Just a few bad apples, surely.

But just one firm -- Baby's Private Eye -- has found thirty abusive sitters who were fired after the firm taped them. Moreover, this is not some big national firm, uncovering abuse coast to coast. These thirty abusers were taped in homes just in the Detroit area.

One sitter with excellent references was taped dragging a crying, 6-month-old girl around by the arm, then throwing her into a bassinet.

The parents fired the 20-year-old sitter, of course, but the sitter went right back into business elsewhere.

Darcy Donnelly, owner of Baby's Private Eye, said: "What some (baby-sitters) do in front of you and what they do when you shut the door can be two different things. ... And that's kind of scary."¹¹⁰

Hidden Abuse, Part II

People always wondered how Ronald "Little Red" Beasley could commit suicide.

He was paralyzed from a stroke, able to move one hand only slightly. He could not walk or feed himself.

So it seemed odd that he could be able to pick up a rifle, put the barrel in his mouth, and pull the trigger.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

The only one with him when he died was his wife, Frances. She claimed that her paralyzed husband loaded the .22-caliber rifle and fired at her on that day in 1967, and then turned the rifle around and killed himself.

The coroner ruled it a suicide. The sheriff refused to reconsider that ruling.

End of story?

No.

Frances moved from Winnsboro, South Carolina, and got married again.

In 1988, her second husband, Jerry Truesdale, was shot to death while driving a van in Roanoke, Virginia. Frances Truesdale claimed someone in a passing car shot him. This time officials didn't believe in "not guilty by reason of ovaries." She was convicted of second-degree murder.

Word of her conviction prompted law enforcement officials back in Winnsboro to reopen the investigation into "Little Red's" death.

Nearly thirty years after she put the gun barrel in the mouth of a helpless, paralyzed man, Frances Truesdale was convicted of "Little Red's" murder.¹¹¹

Adjust the Facts, Ma'am

Let's talk about crusading female reporters who are going to tear the lid off of long-buried secrets.

Let's talk about brave female reporters who aren't going to let anything stand in the way of breaking a murder case wide open.

Let's talk about Carol Schultz, a free-lance writer. She became interested in the long-unsolved murder of three men 25 years ago. The mostly male police department hadn't been able to solve Indianapolis's brutal "LaSalle Street murders," as the 1971 case was known. But Schultz started writing about the case, and soon police arrested the man she pointed the finger at.

The man is a 70-year-old former garage owner. Let's call him "Mr. C.H."

Schultz got the goods on Mr. C.H. by interviewing Floyd Michael Chastain, who is serving a life sentence in Florida for another slaying. Chastain is a former employee of Mr. C.H.

And after Schultz interviewed him, Chastain came forward with a confession. He said both he and Mr. C.H. were the guilty parties.

Chastain then gave police information on the crime scene that had never been made public.

Mr. C.H. was indicted and spent nearly six weeks in jail. Chastain was the star witness in the case against him.

But Chastain had other secrets to tell -- secrets that went all the way to the top.

This wasn't just a plot involving Mr. C.H., he said. No sir. There were bigger fish to fry.

How big?

Well, does the name "Nixon" mean anything to you?

That's right. Chastain said the killings were plotted by President Richard Nixon.

And carried out by Nixon adviser and Watergate figure Charles Colson.

With help from Jimmy Hoffa.

And the threads still lead *all the way to the top.* Chastain said his information on the crime scene came from God.

Prosecutors dropped the charges against Mr. C.H. (We are not giving his full name because it is our policy to withhold the names of victims who have their lives and reputations raped.)

Then authorities started looking at our crusading reporter, Carol Schultz.

They say she gained improper access to police files, then fed the information to Chastain so he would appear to have confidential knowledge about the crime. Schultz was quoted in The Wall Street Journal as admitting that she gave Chastain those details.

But remember the feminist slogan: "Why would she lie?" Why would Schultz set up the innocent Mr. C.H.?

Authorities also found out that she was seeking a Hollywood deal on the case.

Well, why not? A lot of feminist "truths" these days are established through novels, essays, and movies. A lot of feminist research is closer to fiction. Why start quibbling here?

The case had all the makings of a marketable movie. The men who were killed were accused of competing to see who could sleep with the most women. Whether that was a factor in their deaths is not known. But what a scenario it made: sex, violence, men behaving in stereotypical ways, a mysterious crime -- and the smart woman who would

solve it all. Just the time of plot to propel a hit book or movie these days.

The only thing that Schultz needed was a man to hang the murders on. She saw a way to make a lot of money by exploiting a man.

Did it matter that the man was innocent?

Well, being a man, he's a member of the oppressor class. He was probably guilty of something sometime in his life. Might as well make him pay now.

Hey, if that line of reasoning works for affirmative action, how can you object to it now?¹¹²

No Story Here

Teacher Kathy Gerardi had a horrible tale of stalking to tell.

She said a man was stalking her threatening her students at Hall Memorial School in Willington, Connecticut.

Quick, alert the camera crews! Call Katie Couric! Get the made-for-TV-movie people on the line!

Ooops. Forget it. Gerardi now admits that she wrote the threatening letters herself.

Oh, well, break it up, people. Move along. Nothing to see here.

Gerardi was granted special probation on criminal threatening charges. She can even apply for reinstatement for the 1997-98 school year.

Hmm, wonder what she teaches. Women's studies?¹¹³

Another "Choice" in the Trash Can

Jean Miller of Syracuse, New York, is an unmarried woman who already had a baby. When she found herself pregnant again, she decided she didn't want the child, police say.

They say she delivered a son, then drowned him in a bath tub and tossed him into a trash can.

The 20-year-old woman is charged with second-degree murder.

Thank God that "her body, her choice" doesn't always apply.¹¹⁴

Feminist Logic

Boys drop out of school at higher rates.

Boys have greater incidents of alcohol and substance abuse.

Boys commit suicide at higher rates.

- Feminist conclusion: *girls have lower self esteem.*

Women live seven years longer than men.

The fifteen leading causes of death hit men at higher rates and earlier ages.

Men make up 95 percent of fatalities in the workplace.

- Feminist conclusion: *women's health is being "shortchanged."*

The overwhelming majority of the victims of murder and assault are men.

In movies and entertainment, men are the vast majority of the targets of violence.

Women are more likely than men to kill, abuse or neglect their children.

- Feminist conclusion: *there is a war against women.*

Eighty percent of the homeless are men.

Male taxpayers are expected to fund social programs that, for the most part, they can't receive benefits from: Aid to Families With Dependent Children, welfare, the Women's Infants and Children program, shelters for women only.

- Feminist conclusion: *if reform means women get fewer of the benefits that men don't get at all, this constitutes a war against women.*

Women do not have to register with the Selective Service.

Women cannot be compelled to fight or to serve in a combat zone.

Women get out of active service by getting pregnant.

- Feminist conclusion: *women are doing an equal share.*

Affirmative action is discrimination based on sex.

- Feminist conclusion: *discrimination equals equality.*¹¹⁵

Cosmowatch

Cosmopolitan is a leading women's magazine. Its articles and attitudes run counter to feminist claims that women are oppressed by "the beauty trap," that women are less lustful, unfaithful and materialistic than men, that women are just somehow nicer. Cosmo far outsells Ms. Magazine. And the "Cosmo girl" knows darn well she can get

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

what she wants by selling her sexuality or playing hardball at the office. So what attitudes are women buying when they pick up Cosmo? Here's some items from the December 1996 issue:

- "Sexy Little Underthings for Christmas Morning" (page 164)
- "The New Good Girl: The Many Faces of Sexual Guilt: These days, a lot of women are bashing themselves over *nothing.* Why this crippling return to virginal values?" (page 150)

An article on dating, by Patti Davis. It contains some refreshing honesty about dating since the advent of feminism: "In the sixties and seventies, I -- and many of the girls I knew -- were reading Kate Millett and Germaine Greer, composing our own manifestos on sexual politics, learning to be angry at men. We still wanted them, but on our own terms. ... We pursued men, called them whenever we damn-well-wanted-to, turned into huntresses -- smug ones, certain we were after flawed prey. We knew what was wrong with these men before they got to the front door: They weren't sensitive enough, didn't respect our power and accomplishments, So we slept with them, then dumped them, because members of their tribe had done the same to us, and it was payback time." But take what honesty you can from Ms. Davis. She also advocates the sort of deceptive, manipulative dating practices that are coming back into vogue. (page 78)

(And follow up Ms. Davis' sympathetic portrayal of female deception with the following article decrying male deception. Sometimes the double standards in this magazine are just that blatant:) "How Could You Do this To Me? He's a liar and shameless cheat, yet you never suspected a *thing?*" Blind trust can be brutal!" (page 212)¹¹⁶

Humor:

(Note: The Honest Feminist Contest will return next issue. Yes, we promised to announce our winner this issue. But we're trying to build suspense! We're trying to build the expectations! We're trying to find the frickin' files with the info we need ...)

Certs: A Patriarchal Conspiracy

Readers: As we stand on The Bridge to the Next Century, we find that we have wondrous new ways of communicating our thoughts to one another: the computer, the fax, the Internet, and more.

Unfortunately, they don't make those thoughts all that *worth* communicating.

In fact, when you tune into two people discussing feminism on the Usenet, you often get something like the following.

Mr. M-16: "Certs is a candy mint and that's all that it is. These wussies who try to tell you that Certs is a breath mint should get back to the kitchen cookie jar where they belong."

PonytailBoy: "I disagree. Patriarchal society has regulated Certs mynts to the role of candy. But Certs are capable of doing equal work with more 'traditional' breath mints, and they should be given the recognition they deserve."

Mr. M-16: "Get a life, PonytailBoy. They tried giving Certs a chance at the Citadel. They even lowered the standards so that Certs only had to freshen breath after a light lunch, while all the rest had to neutralize a vinaigrette salad, main course, dessert and cigarette. Even with the lighter standards, Certs washed out."

PonytailBoy: "The problem was that Certs wasn't given a supportive environment. It has to do with cultures. Every legitimate test with a level petri dish shows that Certs has equal breath-cleansing power. And there's the matter of how the Certs were packaged to preserve freshness. The Certs were packaged in plastic, while the others were sealed in glass."

Mr. M-16: "Somehow I knew you were going to blame 'the glass sealing.'"

PonytailBoy: "It's true. Glass sealing is a gum-mint conspiracy to keep Certs and other mynts of color down, when in fact they are superior."

Mr. M-16: "Superior is a lake, PonytailBoy. Maybe Certs can handle Shannon Faulkner's breath after she finishes her third bacon cheeseburger deluxe. But when it comes to real Rangers out in the field eating G.I. stew, Certs just ain't making it."

PonytailBoy: "That's funny. When we invaded Panama, Certs did an equal share in neutralizing chicken-with-rice dishes."

Mr. M-16: "What feminist statistics are you using? I remember you bought into that F.A.I.R. study that supposedly 'proved' that the Burger King mascot symbolized patriarchal rape of the environment, while the Wendy's mascot was an enlightened ecofeminist."

PonytailBoy: "That happens to be true, so no wonder you reject it. Wendy's has done much to enlighten the male-dominated fast food industry, including McDonald's. McDonald's has been improving so much that it now has an androgynous mascot with long hair. Of course he's still unfortunately white."

Mr. M-16: "Just keep on bashing white fast-food mascots, PonytailBoy, but our way of life depends on the backbone of defense created by men like Colonel Sanders. They are the only thing keeping you from eating sushi instead of honest American food like pizza. Or knowing you, you probably already do eat sushi. But when our country falls to Islamic radicals with their breath sweetly scented by hashish, then you'll understand."

PonytailBoy: "There you go with another stereotype. 'All Certs make your breath sweet, therefore Arabs are inferior.' Nice comparison. According to your logic, the sun would rise in the east and set in the west. Have you thought of joining the human race?"

Mr. M-16: "Not if means joining YOUR species. I bet you even drink HOMOGEnized milk."

PonytailBoy: "I bet you deny that the Doublemint 'double your fun' slogan is a reference to breasts. You're in denial."

Mr. M-16: "Hey, I think 'double your pleasure' refers to a pair of something. But what would you know about that? You don't HAVE a pair, do you PonytailBoy?"

PonytailBoy: "A pair of what, Mr. M-16? A pair of brain lobes, left and right? As a matter of fact I do have a pair. As for you, maybe you can must a pair of brain CELLS, provided they aren't wasted by whatever substance you've been sniffing. Me, I prefer thinking."

Mr. M-16: "You prefer getting spanked by a woman."

PonytailBoy: "Jealous? Face it, if you treated women better, maybe you could get them to spank you once in a while, too."¹¹⁷

POW says Girls Shortchanged on Height

Girls do not reach the same height as men because society Discourages their growth, says Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women.

"Society sends girls the message that they are not expected to grow tall," said Ms. Hyphenated-Lastname. "Girls are told to 'be a good little girl,' and to be 'mama's little helper,' while boys are encouraged to 'stand tall' and be a 'big man.' The reason that girls do not achieve equal tallness is that they aren't encouraged to.

"And the enforcement of lower expectations continue into adulthood, when wives are referred to as 'the little woman.' The differences in the heights of men and women can be attributed only to socialization. To suggest any other cause is biological determinism.

"To raise girls' negative self-image about their bodies, we are going to have to do something about Barbie dolls," said Ms. Hyphenated-Lastname. "Barbie dolls are, of course, a terrible, negative influence. Look at how Barbie is built. She's only eight inches tall. With a negative role model like that, it's no wonder that girls never grow taller.

"Obviously, to undo centuries of negative brainwashing will Require the establishment of new federal programs run by feminists. We will have to raise girls' self esteem. The best way this can be done is by teaching them feminist philosophy, organizing them into a political constituency, getting them to carry our message and distribute our literature, and instructing them to vote out of office anyone who questions our program. At this rate, our program can go on forever. And with that much time to work with, who knows, we might even get around to addressing the original issues the program was created for.

"Funding for the program should be easy enough to come by. We can take money away from programs designed to keep boys from dropping out of school. If the boys are

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

going to drop out of school, why should we spend our school funding on them? After all, the money should rightly be going to the people with the biggest bureaucracy, not the biggest need.

"This patriarchal suppression of girls' height has not always been the rule. In ancient times, women grew as tall as men, or taller. We know this because feminist historians and archaeologists have been at work. During excavations in neolithic Sumeria, they discovered a gender-equal society that erected statues of women eight feet tall. So obviously, women were taller in the past. In fact, because history has tended to minimize and shrink the contributions of women, it is strong evidence that women in the past were nine or ten feet tall."

"Close study of these statues by feminist historians also reveal that women in the ancient past were dominant and peaceful,

bore no prejudices, were equally left-handed and right-handed, did not litter, managed to balance the budget AND save Medicare, thought only nice thoughts, voted 'no' on 209, felt as one with the earth, and ran homeless shelters for orphaned bunny rabbits and fuzzy baby duckies."

"The statues showed that this was a matriarchal,

goddess-worshipping society because all the statues were of women. But here's an interesting fact. Our researchers discovered that some of the statues had an odd, fleshy appendage hanging between their thighs. We're not quite sure what function this curious appendage served. A ceremonial decoration, perhaps. But we almost lost the chance to study them further. One of our researchers was inexplicably overcome with the urge to start knocking these things off with a chisel.¹¹⁸

1996

1997

JANUARY 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of MANifesto we call THE LIE OF THE LAND, in which we examine yet again feminism's penchant for statements that aren't entirely fair or true.

Of course we can't cover them all -- that would take far more than one newsletter is capable of covering. Besides, you've probably already heard about such anti-male whoppers as "The Super Bowl Battering Hoax" and "The Rule of Thumb Hoax." So in this issue we're going to cover some of the hoaxes and anti-male stereotypes that haven't gotten as much coverage -- including the Snuff Film Hoax. Enjoy.

Snuffing Out Credibility

Many feminists and Women's Studies instructors claim that men film and sell "snuff films" -- movies supposedly made by sadists who kidnap, torture, kill and dismember a victim (usually a woman) so they can film the attack and sell copies of it.

This scenario fits in well with the picture that many feminists want to paint of men: in between watching football and beating their wives, men are sitting on the couch in a torn T-shirt, beer in hand, watching tapes of an actual sex murder.

It makes great anti-male propaganda. However, despite all the claims, there are four major problems

- 1) The most notorious examples of snuff films have turned out to be fakes -- often badly done fakes.

- 2) No law enforcement agency has ever seized an actual snuff film.

- 3) No feminist who claims that snuff films exists can produce a copy to support the claim.

- 4) Journalists who undertook extensive, long-term investigations have been unable to find, buy, or witness a snuff film.

Now if men really are making, selling and watching snuff films, you'd think that someone *somewhere* would be able to find one. After all, if you have a conspiracy to sell illegal drugs, sooner or later police will seize a shipment of illegal drugs. If no one can find a copy of a genuine snuff film, then you'd think that feminists might admit that they either have exaggerated the problem or

have promoted a falsehood that smears the male sex.

But think again. Feminists have never discovered one single snuff film. Yet they continue to claim that snuff films not only exist, but are a widespread problem that reveal all those low and depraved traits they just *know* men harbor. Feminists who cling to the snuff-film legend simply do not let facts get in the way of a good anti-male smear.

One of them is Catherine MacKinnon, the anti-pornography activist. When confronted with the fact that the FBI has never turned up even one snuff film, MacKinnon implies that their investigations aren't complete or competent. (As if the FBI has some sort of good-old-boys network devoted to protecting the makers of snuff films!) MacKinnon was quoted in The San Francisco Chronicle as saying: "My opinion is completely to the contrary to the FBI's. I know snuff films exist. These so-called official people don't enjoy a lot of trust." The paper asked her to substantiate her claim, but she artfully dodged: "To divulge anything would jeopardize my own investigation."

That statement was made in 1994. Since then, MacKinnon's "investigation" has still not turned up a single snuff film. And, to our knowledge, she has not admitted her mistake, either.

People who take a good, honest look at feminism are familiar with this process by now. A feminist makes a wildly anti-male claim, but submits no proof to back it up. Yet she states with absolute conviction that she "knows" it is true.

This is a distressingly common trait of modern feminism: proof is not required when bashing men, and a lack of proof is no deterrent. Also, these types of claims never seem to cost feminists their credibility. They make an anti-male smear, get away with it, and move on to the next anti-male smear. The news media still coming calling, to quote these "experts."

However, when you go to law-enforcement officials, you will find that no commercial snuff films have ever been seized.

Here are excerpts from an extensive investigation into the snuff-film myth by San Francisco Chronicle.*

McDowell writes: "Alan Sears, former executive director of the Attorney General's commission on pornography during 1985-86, agrees with the more than two dozen law enforcement agencies I interviewed. 'Our experience was that we could not find any such thing as a commercially produced snuff film,' says Sears. 'Our commission was all-inclusive and exhaustive. If snuff films were available, we'd have found them.'"

"This sentiment is echoed by Ken Lanning, a cult expert at the FBI training academy at Quantico, Virginia. 'I've not found one single documented case of a snuff film anywhere in the world. I've been searching for 20 years, talked to hundreds of people. There's plenty of once-removed sightings, but I've never found a credible personality who personally saw one.'"

And of the Chronicle's own efforts to find or view a snuff film, the reporter writes: "For six months I have groped ... probing the seedy corners of society's fetishistic netherworld for evidence that snuff films exist. It's been six months of disappointments and fizzling leads, hundreds of phone calls to criminal types and police types, hurried interviews with proprietors of sex shops and S&M parlors, smoky gatherings in underground film clubs, unsolicited applications to join slave societies, purchase discount stun guns and order misogynist films by mail. I've endured watching a myriad of horrible fake snuff films -- some ridiculously fake, the others deemed inauthentic by experts -- with titles such as "Cannibal Holocaust" and "Man Behind the Sun 731." I've pored over dozens of unsolved murders around the country, searching, always searching. To no avail."

Michael F. Knapp, Inspector-Deputy Chief of the FBI's Office of Public and Congressional Affairs, wrote to one skeptic to say: "My colleagues who handle investigative matters which could possibly involve 'snuff films' have advised me that to their

knowledge, the FBI has never found or confiscated a 'snuff film.'"

Perhaps MacKinnon and other feminists want to add The San Francisco Chronicle, the FBI, and all these law-enforcement officials to their list of people who are doing noncredible or suspect research. As for us, we think that MacKinnon's failure to discover even one snuff film is evidence that she is clinging to a myth because it confirms her prejudices about men.

Other people outside law enforcement have looked for snuff films, too. Cecil Adams, the skeptic behind the "Straight Dope" column and TV show, had this to say when asked if there are snuff films: "in a word, no." And twenty years ago, the notorious porno mag "Screw" offered \$25,000 to anyone who had a copy of a snuff film. No takers. "Snuff has been talked about for 20 years," says Manny Neuhaus, former editor of Screw magazine. "Don't you think they'd have turned one up by now?"

At this point you might say that you've heard about snuff films. Let's clear up some questions about them:

Question: Aren't there are films showing real deaths available at many video stores?

Answer: In fact there are several "Faces of Death" films and imitators. They claim to show actual deaths caused by accidents, warfare, crime, animal attacks, capital punishment, and so on. Thus, by definition, they are not snuff films, which are supposedly made by people who kill someone specifically so they can film it and sell it. "Faces of Death"-type films claim that a photographer was on the scene when a death was caused by someone or something else. But in snuff films, the filmmakers are supposedly the ones doing the killing. (And many skeptics say that even those video-store movies contain some obviously faked sequences -- for example, camera angles change just like in a movie, during supposedly continuous sequences filmed by one person standing in one spot with a camcorder.)

Question: Didn't the Charles Manson "Family" film their murders?

Answer: No, but this is the rumor that apparently sparked the myth of snuff films. The San Francisco Chronicle has this to say about the Manson rumor: "According to LAPD Vice Squad Sergeant Don Smith,

* (See "Do snuff films really exist, or are they merely popular myth?" by Rider McDowell, *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 7, 1994.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

snuff films got their name during the 1969 investigation of the Tate-LaBianca murders in Los Angeles. 'The media was mistakenly informed that the Manson people had taken home movies of the murders,' says Smith. 'The press coined the term "snuff films," and it stuck.'

Question: But wasn't there a film back in the 1970s, called "Snuff" or "Snuff in New York City"?

Answer: It was a poorly done fake, says the Chronicle. "Snuff" was one of the earliest snuff-film hoaxes, perpetrated by Alan Shackelton, whom the Chronicle describes as a soft-porn maker and B-movie producer. He "purchased a low-grade exploitation horror film," called "Slaughter," that had been shot in South America. Shackelton shot 15 minutes of new film that supposedly showed an actress being murdered. It must not have been very convincing: the paper describes it as "a celebration of hokey latex and stage blood."

Shackelton booked the film into a Times Square "grind house," in 1975 and promoted it with publicity-seeking "disclaimers" warning away the faint of heart. He even hired "protesters" to picket the film, ensuring even more publicity. Although the film is "almost laughably phony," it helped further the snuff-film legend.

Question: What about "Vampira" and the film that actor Charlie Sheen reportedly saw?

Answer: There was 16mm sex loop called "Vampira," supposedly showing a girl having her intestines cut out. Coroners took one look and noticed that the intestines were from a cow.

In the late 1980s, a Japanese film called "Guinea Pig" attracted attention. The Chronicle says that its viewers included the Charlie Sheen, who thought it showed real scenes of torture. He contacted the FBI, and agents were convinced enough to investigate. But the producers of the film then released "Guinea Pig Two: The Making of Guinea Pig One," revealing the tricks that went into making the realistic scenes. The FBI dropped the case.

Question: Isn't it possible that snuff films exist among a very small group of people and sell for hundreds of thousands of dollars,

so that average people would never be aware of them?

Answer: This is a favorite refrain among those who just can't let go of the snuff-film legend. Just about anything is "possible," but to say it is true requires proof.

And *IF* such films existed in extremely secretive, limited circles, then feminists would not be justified in trying to paint it as a widespread problem in which large numbers of male oppressors are getting their jollies watching the deaths of large numbers of female victims. As with their statistics on anorexia, feminists like to find a huge number of female deaths where there aren't any. It tells you a lot about feminist logic that they think there could be sort of snuff-film "industry" that has managed to churn out a number of widely available films for 20 or 30 years while completely avoiding detection and never leaving a trace.

Question: Hollywood films like "Hard-core" and "52 Pickup" have alluded to snuff films. Maybe Hollywood insiders know something.

Answer: Hollywood is about sensationalism, not reality. If any amateur investigators in such movies manage to breeze right in to a movie theater, plop down and catch a snuff film, then they have succeeded where legions of law-enforcement officials, feminists, and reporters have failed.

In the real world, if any theater showed a snuff film, police could seize it as evidence in a murder investigation. (Depending on local statutes, it might be a criminal offense to simply possess such a film, even for private viewing.) The theater owners could find themselves tied up in an expensive legal or criminal case. What theater could make a profit by showing casual, walk-in customers a film that could be immediately seized and cost them enormous legal expenses?

Question: But isn't it true that some serial killers have filmed their victims?

Answer: This apparently has happened, though the tapes came to light when police seized them from the property of the killer himself. Such films were *not* seized while being sold on some supposed black market or being shown in theaters. Let's distinguish between some sicko videotaping his crime and a supposedly flourishing industry sell-

ing, distributing, and showing such films. The first is possible. The second is a myth.

For example, police in southern California arrested an Anaheim furniture upholsterer after he tried to lure women into the desert. The women were police decoys, and in the desert, police found a stash of saws, axes, pliers, and a camera. He served time for this and, when he got out, he met two women at a party. Their bodies were later found, and the man was sentenced to life in prison for their murders. An accomplice claims that the murders were filmed, but no films were ever found.

Such monsters as this do exist. But one tactic of feminism is to tar all men with the same brush, and in this case the snuff-film myth is the way they do it. They could say the killer is a depraved and monstrous individual, and they would be right. But instead, they try to pin that monstrosity on all men through the myth of snuff films. Instead of saying there is one sick individual carrying out his twisted schemes, they try to make all of us men into a cheering section for the monster. Feminist rhetoric on snuff films is all about blaming as many men as possible by claiming that legions of women are dying for the entertainment of men. It validates feminist's feelings of victimhood, and the only flaw in the argument is that it is based on myth -- which does not seem to be a deterrent to feminists.

Feminists cherish the myth that men support some conspiratorial, underground market for snuff films even though -- after years of determined effort -- they and their supporters have never found this underground trade they "know" exists.

One of those people who "know" is Andrew Vachss, whom the Chronicle describes as an attorney who represents children "and a best-selling author of thrillers."

"Just because you haven't seen any on network news doesn't mean they're not out there," Vachss argues. "When someone steals a Rembrandt, it doesn't show up in a gallery. We know that the Shah of Iran kept videotapes of (the Iranian secret police) Savak torturing people to death. We also know that Idi Amin collected video equipment and routinely witnessed executions. You can draw your own conclusions. ... Serial killers have been documenting their

murders for years," says Vachss. "Do you think it hasn't occurred to one of these people to film a murder, and don't you think that it's possible one of these films is being circulated?"

Vachss displays an attitude that has infected much of academia, feminism, and the politically correct world today. This line of thinking holds that if something is possible, then it's probable, and if it's probable, then it's true. Proof is not required. These people just *know.*

Some feminists like MacKinnon use the snuff-film myth to try to drum up support for their anti-pornography efforts. They run into problems when they try to convince people that photographing a nude woman constitutes assault or exploitation, and there are always freedom-of-speech issues that feminists cannot easily circumvent. But the snuff-film myth gives them a lightning-rod for drawing support. Lots of people are ambivalent about nude centerfolds, but the idea of women being tortured and murdered is very alarming. Feminists often have trouble trying to fire people up with moral outrage over the fact that women are being photographed nude for the pleasure of men -- so they up the ante and claim that women are being tortured and killed. It's a handy way for feminists to smear even the glossy, airbrushed Playboy centerfold and claim that all such photographs ultimately are merely the first step on the road that leads to snuff films. When you get into a discussion with an anti-porn feminist, eventually she might declare that women are being tortured and murdered for the enjoyment of men. Ask her to provide her sources, and she won't be able to.

But the lack of evidence probably won't change her mind, either.

And this goes right back to some of the top leaders of feminism, who support such myths. When they can't get results by arguing that a well-paid centerfold model is being "exploited," they inject the snuff-film myth, feeling that the end justifies such dishonest means. For feminists, there are only two possible downsides to the snuff-film myth. One is that it isn't true, and the

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

other is that casts an undeserved blanket smear on the entire male sex.*

Of course, for many feminists, these are not reasons enough to refrain.¹¹⁹

Night Lyin'

When critics of feminism say that news coverage is sometimes biased, we get a familiar response. Feminists jeer, "Oh, I suppose that feminists own the news media now. I suppose feminists give them orders."

No, the bias isn't due to feminists owning the media.

They just borrow it now and then.

Feminism is a major political force. It has well-organized members -- lawyers who threaten to sue, columnist who threaten to embarrass, protesters who threaten to picket. And perhaps most of all, it has woman -- the ones who control a major portion of household expenditures. The ones who control the purse strings. The ones that advertisers and the news media don't want to piss off.

The news media know darn well that feminists can do them damage. But men's groups? They're still don't have anything near the clout.

The news media can ignore men's rights and pander to feminists, and it's good for the bottom line.

And it's not just the small papers or two-bit local news anchors who do it.

At times, it's even a respected journalist like Ted Koppel.

On Nov. 14, Koppel's "Nightline" presented a report entitled, "A Child's World," covering the (supposed) problem that child witnesses are losing credibility in our courts.

After all the false, coerced testimony from children on supposed "satanic cults" in day-care centers, it would seem like a positive move. After innocent people have been freed from jails -- sent there on admittedly false testimony -- it seems like we ought to be

questioning some of the leading, distorting and manipulative techniques used to get false testimony from children.

And, seeing how this is "Nightline," a respected show, you'd hope that Koppel would give the issue a fair hearing.

But Nat Hentoff, a syndicated columnist who specialized in rights -- even for unpopular groups -- was amazed at how biased Koppel's show was.[†]

Hentoff writes: "Erin Hayes, Koppel's reporter that night, made a point of saying that Ralph Underwager, a guest who testifies for the defense, is paid well for each day in court. She neglected to add that expert witnesses for the prosecution in these cases are also paid well. I don't recall this kind of crudely prejudicial reporting on "Nightline" before."

Koppel said the idea for the program was brought to him by Civia Tamarkin, who has served on the advisory board of an organization called Believe the Children. (This is the group that never believes the children when they say they *haven't* been abused or molested. Their tactics have been behind a number of false accusation cases that eventually were overturned. These tactics include leading and coercive interviews with children, duping them, hounding them and even threatening them until they repeat back the accusations that Believe The Children counselors want.)

Nevertheless, Tamarkin insisted to Koppel that she was "neutral" on the issue of child testimony. A Believe The Children board member, and she's neutral?

What's more, Koppel said, "We have found her to be a useful, objective and reliable source."

Absolutely amazing. The woman is an activist with an agenda. And Koppel finds her "objective and reliable."

As Hentoff wrote: "Tamarkin has indeed devoted a lot of attention to child sex abuse, along with an abiding conviction of most defendants' guilt. For instance, she has praised the prosecution in the North Carolina Little Rascals day care case. Those prosecutors were definitively discredited in a PBS "Frontline" documentary series by Ofra

* Sources and acknowledgements. Opinions expressed above are those of Per's MANifesto. Much of the source material is available at the Alt.Folklore.Urban home page. For additional information and the complete text of the San Francisco Chronicle article, Visit the AFU & Urban Legend Archive at <http://www.urban-legends.com/and> click on "Classic" and then "Snuff Films," or go to that section directly, at: <http://www.urbanlegends.com/classic/snuff.films/>

(The full text of the FBI letter from Michael F. Knapp is available at: http://www.urbanlegends.com/classic/snuff.films/snuff_films_fbi.html)

† (See "'Nightline' Caught off Balance," November 30 1996; Page A19, The Washington Post.)

Bikel. They were also reprimanded by the higher courts.

"For a long time, I interviewed prosecutors and defense lawyers in the Little Rascals prosecutions and read trial transcripts. It was clear that the child witnesses had been persistently manipulated by therapists and prosecutors who had abandoned the very idea of due process.

"Tamarkin also believes that the bizarrely unjust McMartin day-care prosecution in California should have resulted in convictions. The prosecutors there have also been utterly discredited. To use Tamarkin as an expert on child sex abuses cases is like having David Bonior shape an "objective" look at Newt Gingrich."

Okay, are we willing to admit there might be some bias in this "Nightline" report?

"Nightline's" bias extended to their efforts to discredit Cornell University psychiatrist Stephen Ceci, a respected authority who has done experiments on the credibility of children's testimony. Ceci told Hentoff that the interview "Nightline" conducted with him was done in an unusually aggressive, confrontational and sometimes hostile manner. "I felt I had been in a 10-round prizefight and lost."

"These people from 'Nightline,'" Ceci says, "had their agenda going in, and they used what they chose from the interviews to support that agenda. It was sad, because on this issue, both people's freedom is at stake and also children's safety. This could have been a truly balanced illuminating program."

"I was shocked," Helene Hembrooke, a postdoctoral researcher at Cornell, told Hentoff after observing the interview. "We were sure it would be a balanced piece. After all, it was 'Nightline,' it was Ted Koppel."

We are not shocked.

After all, it's feminism.¹²⁰

Ending the Good-Old-Boys Club

One of the claims you hear feminists make is that getting more of their members into positions of power will clean up government.

So let's look at some women who got government jobs and a really cleaning up.

There's Janet Reno. So what if she presided over the mass-immolation of a cult in Waco, sniper attacks in Idaho, and a few

hysteria-driven prosecutions based on questionable child testimony? Small stuff. Then she started committing some real offenses: she extended the Whitewater investigations of independent counsel Kenneth Starr.

President Clinton made it clear that he wasn't pleased. With the same subtlety with which he refused to rule out pardons for his Whitewater cronies, Clinton also was eloquently silent about saying whether he would reappoint Reno during the president's second term.

The timing was notable. Critics of Clinton were seeking an independent counsel to look into all the funny money floating into Democrat campaigns chests -- some of it from non-citizens, and thousands of it from people who had taken oaths of poverty!

Reno played right along. She said an independent counsel was not needed because any offenses apparently were done by low-level officials. (So Al Gore, holding the money bag at fundraisers, must be a low level official.) And Reno said no one had found any tangible evidence of wrongdoing. Apparently the woman in charge of the Justice Department hasn't heard names like the Lippo Group or John Huang.

So Reno finally said that she'd only agree to a vague "task force" that would look into the mess someday, and make some sort of general report -- in the sweet by and by.

And Clinton gave her her job back.

This is how feminists put an end to the good-old-boy network.

They put a good old girl in there.

And speaking of good old girls, there's Deedee.

Deedee Corradini is the first woman mayor of Salt Lake City.

She's female. She's a Democrat. She's one step away from sainthood, right?

Well, actually it looks to us like she's one step ahead of the law.

Her troubles haven't gotten the national publicity of another Utah woman, Enid "I don't know nothing" Waldholtz. But Corradini has admitted to soliciting personal "gifts" from some of the most powerful and influential people in the state -- including people who do business with the city.

Corradini was trying to pay off debts from a failed business venture. As mayor, she started taking in "gifts" from businesses that

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

lease space from the city, from union officials who have interests in city labor contracts, from people who want public recognition, who lease facilities from the city, or have other reasons for trying to stay on the good side of the mayor.

In one case, she called a businessman on his car phone as he was coming to bring her a \$5,000 check. Her reason for calling: she wanted him to up it to \$6,000. When he got to her office, Mayor Corradini was waiting at the curb for the money.

Now that's public service.

In these days of feminism, some things never change. Women still expect a lot of nice gifts. Corradini insists, however, that all the gifts are from friends -- even though she's not sure she knew all these "friends" before she took over the powers of the mayor's office.

The city has a law that prohibits public officials from taking anything worth more than \$50 that "tends to influence" them in their decision-making. One businessman who leases airport space with the city gave Corradini and her husband \$40,000 worth of stock.

For some reason, no charges have been brought against her.

She has exceeded the \$50 limit somewhat.

She admits to taking more than \$200,000 in "gifts."

Yes, it's true what feminists say: women in government certainly will clean up.*

And while we're on the topic of feminism's own myths, let's look at the myth that women are much more peaceful than men. True, women are on average shorter and less strong than men. For some reason, the fact that they're more likely to lose a fair fight with a man has somehow earned women the reputation of being more peaceful. In fact, women just take out their aggression on the ones who are smaller than them -- namely, children. What would be called "domestic violence" when done by a man is called "discipline" when done by a woman.

While smaller women might be more reluctant to risk *committing* violence, they are perfectly capable of *ordering* violence.

Give women leaders an army of men, and they will bring about invasions, plundering, colonialism and nationalism just as well as any man. They truly are equal.

Which brings us to Madeleine Albright, who used to be the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations.

Colin Powell had to deal with Ms. Albright when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Now, he was the professional soldier, and she was the civilian. But he says he nearly had "an aneurysm" when hearing Albright's warlike policies. She once said to him, "What's the point of having this superb military you're always talking about if we can't use it?"

Not to worry. Albright is no longer our U.N. ambassador.

No sir. Now she's our secretary of state.

Bill Clinton must have listened to all the rhetoric about how women in government will be oh so much more peaceful.

Sleep well.¹²¹

Another Story You Might Have Missed

Here at Per's MANifesto, we take pride in bringing you stories that just *somehow* slip past the national news media. Stories that would have been a big thing -- if the accused has been a man.

And especially if the accused had been a sports figure.

For instance, consider the different attention paid to Michael Irvin and Ryan Thompson.

Irvin, the Dallas Cowboys wide receiver, was accused by a woman who said that he and another man raped her, threatened to kill her, and videotaped the attack. The police talked to the press about the accusations before they even moved to arrest anybody. The news media flashed the story on page one.

And then the woman's ex-husband said she had a history of making similar false accusations.

Irvin has every right to be mad. Yes, he has been convicted of cocaine possession. But that's a separate story. Since when does a police department start holding press conferences before any charges have been filed? Irvin has every right to be mad. Yes, he has previously been convicted of cocaine possession. But that's a separate story. Since

* (See "Salt Lake City Ponders Mayor's Acceptance of a Little Help From 'Friends' " in the *Washington Post*, Dec. 22, 1996, page A3.)

when does a police department start holding press conferences before any charges have been filed?

The false accuser -- a stripper named Nina Shahravan, 23 -- is going to be charged with filing a false police report. That's a good start. But the penalty for false accusation is still laughably trivial. The absolute maximum Shahravan person can face is six months in jail and a \$2,000 fine. Watch her plea-bargain that down, then cash in on her new notoriety. And the ludicrous part of this is that the charge is filing a false police report, a misdemeanor.

When she accused Irvin, it was a front-page story. When her story was shown to be false, it wasn't played up quite as much. And now here's a story the papers didn't play up at all.

Cleveland Indian outfielder Ryan Thompson was stalked by his estranged wife. As he was in his car during a Thanksgiving visit with family in Maryland, Melody Blackstone-Thompson allegedly found him and rammed her car into his.

After her car ran off the road, Thompson drove off an notified police. Blackstone-Thompson was charged with second-degree assault and released on personal recognition.

No word on whether she had been coming from a viewing of "The First Wives Club."¹²²

False Accusations are Bad Because ...

The brief last issue of Per's MANifesto forwarded to you a Washington Post article on companies overreacting to sexual harassment accusations.*

This article was part of a series on sexual harassment at work. (It was the *last* segment of the series.)

While the Post should be commended just for admitting that false or exaggerated complaints are made, there is still work to be done.

For one thing, the concept of false or exaggerated accusations was dealt with in a separate article. These issues should be part of the *main* coverage whenever sexual harassment accusations are raised. Accusa-

tions that are false or motivated by personal animosity or dishonesty are a part of the entire issue. No coverage of sexual harassment is complete without considering that some accusations are false. Unfortunately, the news media often seem bent on presenting incomplete coverage.

Any article that treats all accusations as true is a biased article.

Speaking of bias, some of it did creep into this Post article, particularly in the way it was worded. It said "Many accused harassers take to the courts to try to avenge themselves ..." Why are these people described as trying to "avenge themselves"? It makes them sound like bloodthirsty avengers, rather than people who have been wronged.

Then there was this strikingly bizarre statement by a feminist lawyer. "There's a dichotomy in our economy," said employment attorney Rita Risser, a principal in Fair Measures, a workplace training and advisory firm in Santa Cruz, Calif. "Some organizations will tolerate gross harassment -- rape, stalking, attempted murder -- and won't do anything, but other organizations will fire someone for doing something minor ..."

This is a feminist with a law degree, working to enforce sexual harassment laws -- and she seems to think there are companies that tolerate "rape, stalking, attempted murder."

We particularly enjoyed the reply that Michael S. posted to this: "Oh, yeah, it's really awful about all those organizations that tolerate rape and attempted murder. I hate them. Lets see, there's... Um, no. Well, what about... Er... Well, there's prisons. But the victims there are men, so that doesn't count." Well said.

And we've just got to reprint that stunning example of feminist logic that closed the article. It quoted Susan Webb, "president of Seattle-based Pacific Resource Development Group, a pioneer in the field of sexual harassment prevention training and an expert witness on the topic for the past decade."

"If you under-react and punish people too lightly, it shows you don't care," she said. "If you overreact, a lot of women will be impacted, too."

So if you under-react, it's bad because it hurts women. And if you overreact and fire a

* ("In Combating Sexual Harassment, Companies Sometimes Overreact," By Kirstin Downey Grimsley, *The Washington Post*, Monday, December 23 1996; Page A01.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

man on little or no grounds, it is also bad -- because it hurts women!

Thanks for that lesson in equality.¹²³

Cosmowatch

Cosmopolitan is a leading women's magazine. Its articles and attitudes run counter to feminist claims that women are oppressed by "the beauty trap," that women are less lustful, unfaithful and materialistic than men, that women are just somehow nicer. Cosmo far outsells Ms. Magazine. And the "Cosmo girl" knows darn well she can get what she wants by selling her sexuality or playing hardball at the office. So what attitudes are women buying when they pick up Cosmo? Here's some items from the January, 1997, issue:

- A list (page 124) about "What's Sexy in a Man." Some of the things that are sexy: "Cash in his wallet, preferably in big bills (we can't believe we're saying this, but money *is* a turn-on)" "Big shoulders and a muscular chest," "Power (even if he's ugly)," "Flat tummy," "Leg muscles and a small, tight butt."
- An ad that shows an expensive Oneida fork that was destroyed in a garbage disposal. The ad says "Replacing it is almost as easy as blaming someone else."
- On page 168 is a pandering propaganda piece, written by a man and titled "How Different Are Men and Women?" This fellow's point can be summed up thusly:
 - A) There are no differences between men and women, and
 - B) The differences, which don't exist, don't count anyway.

It's pretty obvious that Mr. Scheer was out to sell an article to Cosmo and wasn't about to stop at groveling. He says: "Recently, we celebrated only the second female to become a Fortune 500 CEO -- merely 498 to go!"

As they say today, "You go, Robert."

Mr. Scheer maintains that "Men and women are exactly the same in every modern relevant respect except one -- the mechanics of procreation and all that this immutable biological distinction portends for daily behavior. All else is sufficiently the same between the genders as to render efforts to focus on the differences largely a waste of time."

So Mr. Scheer is one of those obedient fellows who will cheer for women replacing *all* men as Fortune 500 CEOs, and still

claim he is interested in equality. And this is a familiar sort of equality, in which all fault for women's behavior can be placed on *men.* Hence his assertion that "The occupational barriers between men and women turn out to be far more a matter of prejudice than of reason." It's all men's fault, you see. Never mind that women overwhelmingly seek out safe jobs. So any difference in pay and accomplishment has to be traced back to men -- even if it stems from the behavior of women.

Mr. Scheer is quite eager to dismiss as irrelevant any evidence that doesn't support his theory on the innate sameness of men and women: "I have abandoned the attempt to read meaning into the flimsy neurological evidence available as to gender differences," he writes. "Why am I supposed to be excited over the news that men are better at orienting three-dimensional objects in space?"

Frankly, Robert, we don't give if you get excited. In fact, we'd prefer that you didn't.

But if you hadn't "abandoned" the pursuit of knowledge and insight, you might be forced to admit that a greater ability to orient three-dimensional objects in space is just the sort of skill you need to build a house, be a draftsman, shoot an arrow, design an engine, wire a home, or lay out the course of a road or a canal. In other words, some of the "occupational barriers" you so glibly dismiss as "a matter of prejudice" are actually rooted in real abilities -- with real differences between the sexes.

Robert goes on: "The scientific evidence on sexual differences is actually quite paltry," he claims, "and represents the triumph of machinery over common sense. Suddenly we had the ability to do MRI scans of the human brain and discovered that women, when processing language, tend to use both sides of the brain while men use only one. What significance this has is anyone's guess," he says dismissively.

What significance, Robert? You acknowledge there is a fundamental, brain-level difference in the processing of language and can't see how that might affect how people think? Or how they write novels? "There is also the testosterone that exists in men's brains in larger quantities," Robert gushes on the way to dismissing reality once again. "But what exactly the

hormone does there is more the source of giggles than of serious thought."

Mr. Scheer, try trading in your giggles for some serious thought.

He also notes that men have "a larger frontal lobe, which is said to be crucial to reasoning." How to dismiss this one? Robert tells us that the size difference goes away after age 50. Which is a round-about way of admitting that it exists for roughly the initial three-fourths of a man's life.

It is very odd that Mr. Scheer is so determined to insist there are no differences between men and women when he keeps citing so many of them: the finer motor skills of girls, differences in navigating and using maps, differences in reflexes, hormones, brain size, and so on.

But he can see hope for us. He says the differences between men and women will "start fading any millennium now as manifestations of masculinity and femininity continue to blur into one androgynous sex. Perhaps we'll even become hermaphroditic."

Um, Robert *after you.*

We hope that letting you go first is not considered sexist.¹²⁴

FEBRUARY 1997

WELCOME, READERS. This month we look at "The Wages of Men." If you know feminists, you know that they set their eyes on the elite among men and then demand "equality." They seem to overlook the lower rungs, where most of the people doing dangerous, dirty jobs are men. Feminists aren't demanding equality of risk, just equality of results. And they are demanding absolute safety for themselves in the workplace, even safety from unwanted comments. They seem considerably less concerned about men who die on the job. But then, the safety measures required to save men's lives would increase the costs of goods and services. And this might put a crimp in a feminist's ability to jet to the next high-powered seminar on women as victims.

So let's look at the wages of women -- and "The Wages of Men."

Seeing Through the Glass Ceiling

Women make less than men, and the reason is discrimination.

That's the popular wisdom, brought to you by the news media and their feminist sources.

But this popular wisdom is more popular than wise.

The Independent Women's Forum, a non-profit group based in Washington, D.C., and the American Enterprise Institute recently release a report titled "Women's Figures." It points out how flawed this assumption is.

"In many cases where women remain behind men, market forces explain outcomes more readily than overt discrimination," the report says. "Occupation, seniority, absenteeism, and intermittent work-force participation are all critical variables in accounting for pay disparities. In other words, those who assume that discrimination is solely to blame for wage differences are drawing unsubstantiated conclusions. The issue is far more complex."

But woe unto those who attempt to challenge that popular wisdom. "Challenging those long-held assumptions about women is a perilous exercise, particularly because many groups have an investment in maintaining myths such as the wage gap and the glass ceiling. Both the wage gap and the glass ceiling are rhetorically useful but factually corrupt catch phrases."

True, it's not popular to note that the choices women make often influence, or even determine, their earning power. When women make equal choices (and equal sacrifices) then there is little difference in pay. "Economist June O'Neill notes, 'When earnings comparisons are restricted to men and women more similar in their experience and life situations, the measured earnings differentials are typically quite small.'"

And there are other areas where there is obvious and growing inequalities, yet feminists aren't objecting. Why? Because the inequality is in their favor. "Women are represented in great numbers at the college and postgraduate levels and have outnumbered men in graduate school since the mid-1980s. In 1996, women represent 54 percent of the class admitted to Yale Medical School. In 1994, women earned more associate, bachelor's and master's degrees than men."

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

We wonder why equality is no longer an issue when women are ahead. But that is the way feminism works. Feminism sets its sights on the best conditions enjoyed by men and demands equality of results. Not equality of sacrifice.

You can read more excerpts from "Women's Figures at the IWF web site"...

But as instructive as this report is, it still doesn't mention one of the greatest gender gaps today -- the death of men on the job. So let's take a look at "The Wages of Men."¹²⁵

The Wages of Men

When feminists claim that women aren't paid the same for equal work, ask them if they know the ratio of work-related deaths for men and women. Most of them probably don't, and don't want to hear about it. But the fact is that men make up about 95 percent of workers who die because of workplace trauma.

When employers have a dirty or dangerous job they have to fill, they usually have to pay more to get someone to do it. Jobs like waitress or receptionist might pay less, but they are safer. Women could apply for those higher-paying, more dangerous jobs. But by and large they opt for safer jobs. Feminists complain that such women make less money. But they don't complain when the people dying on the job are men.

Men face a double whammy from this today. First, when all the safe jobs are taken, that leaves the dangerous ones primarily for men. Thus the ones getting sick or injured on the job are overwhelming men. Then feminists ignore such sacrifices and demand affirmative-action discrimination against men to close the supposed "pay gap." Feminists are so well organized -- and the news media and politicians are so cooperative -- that feminists have managed to turn the higher death rates of men into a victimhood issue for women.

But we decided to take a look at what is really going on.

Percentages are abstract concepts. We decided to put a human face on what is really happening. Every time the news mentioned a worker being killed on the job, we clipped

the article and noted whether the victim was a man or a woman. The results are below.

This is not a scientific survey, and we aren't presenting it as such. (We'll let feminists do this with their "anecdota.") The intention was to look at the human side -- to note the names and the jobs of workers who are killed. These people aren't just statistics: they're human beings.

Here is what we found:

- David D. Hart, 36, died at the Lobdell-Emory plant in Argos, Indiana, when he became trapped in a press. The coroner listed the cause of death as multiple blunt force injuries to the head and chest. Hart was a maintenance worker. (Remember, feminists want secretaries and receptionists to have equal pay with maintenance workers.)
- A man whose name was not immediately released was killed February 4th when a clock tower collapsed on him at a demolition site in Dallas. The man was using a large backhoe to clear rubble at a building that once housed the world headquarters of the Dr Pepper company. "Demolition of a building is always a risky venture," said a spokesman for the investment company that ordered the demolition.
- Elevator repairman David Flanagan, 22, was crushed to death while servicing an elevator in Troy, New York, January 21st. Police said he became trapped and was crushed between the elevator and the concrete wall.
- Mark Seavey, 37, died January 21 from burns he received in an explosion on the painting line at the Vermeer Manufacturing factory in Pella, Iowa.
- Paul Dorweiler, 33, died in a fall while contracting to clear snow off the roof of a business building in Dawson, Minnesota.
- A 37-year-old man drowned February 3 when the dump truck he was driving rolled into a pond at a quarry near Sherwood, Oregon.
- On February 2nd, cab driver Phillip R. Collins, 53, of Pleasantville, N.J., was found dead at the wheel of his cab, which was engulfed in flames. An autopsy showed that he had been shot twice in the back of the head. Collins worked as a mail clerk for the county government and moonlighted as a taxi driver.
- Three Coast Guard members -- all men -- died February 2nd in the Pacific Ocean off the Washington coast while on a rescue mission. Their 44-foot boat capsized

* See: <<http://www.iwf.org/>>

en route to a rescue effort at the mouth of the Quillayute River. A forth crew member, also a man, was found alive and rescued. The crew had been sent to help a sailboat, the Gale Runner, which reported it was taking on water. A Coast Guard helicopter rescued the man and woman aboard the sailboat.

- Three Fort Rucker Army soldiers -- all men -- killed January 31 during training. Their UH-1H Iroquois helicopter crashed in rural Geneva County, Alabama. The instructor pilot was identified as Army Chief Warrant Officer 2 Robert P. Leaver, 35, of New Bedford, Mass. The two student pilots were Army 1st Lt. Scott R. Cummins, 25, of Germantown, Tennessee, and Air Force 2nd Lt. Jason J. Baker, 24, of Decorah, Iowa.
- Ba Huynh, 26, a deliveryman for a Chinese restaurant in Boston, was shot in the stomach by robbers but survived. Meanwhile, in crime-plagued Gary, Indiana, Federal Express has abandoned a measure designed to protect the safety of its deliverymen. The violence-plagued city had the country's highest per-capita murder rate in 1995. So FedEx couriers had been working earlier hours to be off the streets at dark. "We have had a number of incidents in the recent past when employees felt their safety was being threatened," FedEx spokesman Greg Rossiter said from the company's headquarters in Memphis, Tenn. But under pressure from Gary's Mayor Scott King, they've gone back to the later schedule. The lives of couriers just can't compete with the importance of speedy deliveries.

These are all the news stories we happened upon since setting out to look for them for this issue of MANifesto. Looking back on them, every single death recorded here was the death of a man. This isn't a scientific cross section, of course, and we don't claim it is. But if we had encountered a news item about a woman being killed because of her job, we would have included it here. There were so many stories about men being killed because death on the job is one of the few exclusive men's clubs left.

And, judging by statistics, we would have had to heard about ninety-five stories of men's job-related deaths to find five stories about women.

But those are cold statistics. The men described above are real. They did dangerous work, and it caught up with them. The only

concern that feminists seem to have for these men is that they might have been earning a bit more than a secretary in an air-conditioned office.

These men did dangerous work, and it killed them. But the nature of men is such that even the lack of work can hurt them.

Consider Milton B. Talbert of Charlottesville, Virginia, a former police lieutenant.

Talbert held the job for 34 years before coming down with pneumonia in 1994. He was ready to go back to work, but his wife says the department pressured him to take early retirement or limited hours. Losing the job led to a deep depression that caused him to take his life, says his widow, Shirley Talbert.

She is suing for \$2.85 million in damages.¹²⁶

More Choices Without Voices

Here are some domestic violence cases you won't see feminists becoming outraged over.

A newborn girl was found dead, wrapped in towels and stuffed in a garbage bag in the trunk of her mother's car, which was parked outside the Holy Family Catholic Church. The coroner determined the baby was born alive sometime between Jan. 7-8 and was full-term.

Jennifer Pyles, 21, of Steubenville, Ohio, was charged on February 5th with involuntary manslaughter and abuse of a corpse. Maximum sentence if convicted: five years.

The charges could be upgraded to murder if it's determined that she intended to kill the baby.

In Greensboro, North Carolina, a newborn baby was found dead in a garbage dumpster. The baby was just a few days old and still had an umbilical cord attached when it died.

Law enforcement officials have not found the mother. They organized a funeral for the anonymous child.

In Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, a woman was sentenced to four to eight years in prison in the death of her newborn baby.

The judge said that a lighter sentence for Cheryl Fries, 32, would "cheapen the life of that child that was taken away."

Fries' infant daughter suffocated and bled to death on Oct. 9, 1995.¹²⁷

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Flying High with the First Wives Club

Speaking of domestic violence: If you saw the film "The First Wives Club," you know how positively knee-slapping funny domestic violence is, when done by women against men.

And if you read some of the reaction from feminist columnists, you know how "empowering" a movie like this is. And how bad men are for objecting to women who finally "fight back." To feminists, revenge isn't just policy. It's a sacrament.

So let's side with the feminists on this one. Let's put our collective foot down and tell all those up-tight, humorless men to stop throwing a hissy over the idea that revenge against men is fun, constructive, justified, and never, ever excessive.

For instance, let's look all have a good chuckle over the little bit of empowerment practiced by Deborah Loeding of Waldwick, New Jersey.

The target for her empowering exercise was her ex-husband. In feminist circles, this puts him one notch away from Attila the Hun. So the guy must have deserved it, being an ex-husband and all.

What did she do? Well, get ready to slap them knees. She baked marijuana into some bread and gave it to him without telling him what was in it.

Are we laughing yet? Maybe not, because this doesn't show how he might have gotten hurt -- which of course is the funny part if you're a feminist.

Loading's ex-husband had to take a random drug test at his job. He tested positive and was fired.

There! What can be funnier than destroying a man's reputation and livelihood through deceptive and false practices?

Oh, there were some complications to the plot, though.

Her ex-husband is a pilot for Continental Airlines.

So I guess some of those up-tight men might complain that she should have left the nation's airline passengers out of her revenge plot. Or that in a midair emergency, there are no time for slowed reactions that could make the difference between a bad scare and a terrible tragedy.

But hey, we have to remember that revenge is empowering. Lighten up. Smile.

And make sure that the next time she pulls this stunt, the airplane is loaded with feminists.

(Oh, one more thing. Loading admitted to the plot and her ex got his job back, and now Continental is suing her. We hope a great big fat penalty against her gives her the wonderfully empowering experience of learning to be responsible for her actions.)¹²⁸

Cosmowatch

Cosmopolitan is a leading women's magazine. Its articles and attitudes run counter to feminist claims that women are oppressed by "the beauty trap," that women are less lustful, unfaithful and materialistic than men, that women are just somehow nicer. Cosmo far outsells Ms. Magazine. And the "Cosmo girl" knows darn well she can get what she wants by selling her sexuality or playing hardball at the office. So what attitudes are women buying when they pick up Cosmo? Here's some items from the March 1997 issue:

- Article: "Your New Man: How to Make the Sex So good He'll Be Groveling."
- An article on "relationship milestones" that often judges relationships in monetary terms. If "you read ski brochures and make plans for next season," that rates a "thumbs up." Likewise if "you agree on a dream getaway destination." Also rated are the "first gift exchange," exchanging house keys, and moving in.
- Article: "Saturday Night Sexy: Slip on these new wearably bare evening pieces and knock his socks off."
- Article: "David Duchovny Undresses four Us (and Talks): Getting X-rated With the Sexiest Man on Television."
- MTV hostess Carmen Electra gives dating tips that are "easy as 1-2-3. Wear something hot. Stay true to yourself. No kissing on the first date. Well, maybe a little kiss." (So what does that boil down to? Tease, don't please.)¹²⁹

Per's Picks

The Per's MANifesto Home Page now has a very few, select links that might be of interest to you.¹³⁰ [...]

In additions to those links, we'd also like to plug the following: The Independent Women's Forum (referred to above) features

well-researched articles that speak out against extreme feminist claims and rhetoric. Contributors have taken the message to the mainstream media, including *The Wall Street Journal*.¹³¹ [...]

And here's another site that takes a very personal stance against man-bashing and feminist extremism. It's Vera's Feminist Lies Homepage...¹³² Please visit Vera's site, add some kind words to her guestbook, and thank her for being strong and independent enough to refuse to toe the feminist line.¹³³

Next Issue:

Is it true that medieval lords once had a "first night" right to sleep with brides on their wedding nights? We'll take a look at another long-standing bit of folklore in an issue with the theme "Stupid Law Tricks."¹³⁴

MARCH 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of Per's MANifesto where we take a look at STUPID LAW TRICKS. Is it true that lords of old once had the right to sleep with a bride on her wedding night? Is community service the proper punishment for cold-blooded murder? When is a child who is not your child -- your child? If you need any more evidence that the law is an ass, take a look legalistic look at the "patriarchal" justice system that supposedly is biased in favor of men.

Not Tonight, Dear, I have an Urban Legend

In the January issue of Per's MANifesto, we dissected the myth of snuff films. We hope that article gave you lots of information you could use to shoot down another one of feminism's cherished anti-male myths.

So we're at it again, this time chasing down the idea that medieval lords once had the "right of the first night" to sleep with brides on their wedding nights.

Was it true that laws gave lords such a horrible power over hapless female victims? Or is it one of those urban legends that gets repeated because it sounds so titillating?

Well, here's the info you'll need the next time a feminist starts preaching about her

victimhood by citing the "right of the first night."

We found that the subject had been discussed by Cecil Adams, the noted skeptic and author of "The Straight Dope" column. His December 20, 1996, column debunks the idea.

"The right of the first night," Cecil says, is "also known as the *jus primae noctis* (law of the first night), the *droit du seigneur* (the lord's right), etc." Mention of it has been made in several works of fiction, which proves nothing other than that authors found it to be a titillating plot device.

If it was a widespread practice, then surely it would be mentioned in the history books. And if it was the law, then surely it would be in the law books. So where is it?

Cecil found the historical record to be unconvincingly thin. He cites records by the 16th-century chronicler Boece, who wrote that a Scottish king, Evenus III, decreed that "the lord of the ground *sal* have the maidenhead of all virginis dwelling on the same." This, according to Boece, went on for hundreds of years until one Saint Margaret abolished it. Trouble is, there was no King Evenus, and Boece includes material that is clearly mythological. Plus he wrote this down long after the supposed events. Who knows what his sources were. Myth is not history, Women's Studies courses not withstanding.

"If you believe the popular tales," says Cecil, "the *droit du seigneur* prevailed throughout much of Europe for centuries. Yet detailed examinations of the available records by reputable historians have found 'no evidence of its existence in law books, charters, decretals, trials, or glossaries,' one scholar notes. No woman ever commented on the practice, unfavorably or otherwise, and no account ever identifies any female victim by name."

Cecil noted -- and we agree -- that men in power have often used that power to cajole, entice, or coerce women into sex. So why would they need to create such a law? And why would they decide to get their jollies on the one night that would move the greatest number of people to maximum rage?

It's interesting that feminists put so much faith in the existence of *droit du seigneur* when it drastically contradicts one of the

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

pillars of feminist belief. That's the belief that men treated their women like property and set up society so that each man jealously and even violently guarded access to his woman. It's hard to reconcile that view of men with the idea that they'd let some rich old geezer waltz into their bedrooms on their honeymoon night.*

Men joke about this supposed right of the first night as some sort of locker-room humor. But feminists trot it out because it confirms (and promotes) all their worst prejudices about men. Why would they cling to such a belief in the absolute lack of any historical record? The next time one of them does try to pass off this old myth, you'll have the facts you need to rebut her. In the battle of feminism vs. truth, turn to Per's MANifesto for facts like these.¹³⁵

Stupid Lawyer Trick

During much of his 18-year marriage, Joseph Stropnick was a stay-at-home husband. He took care of their two children, the housework, etc.

Stropnick had even worked to support himself and his wife while she went through medical school.

Then his marriage broke up. At the time, he was working only part time, making a tenth of the salary of his ex-wife, a pediatrician.

So Joseph wanted a lawyer who was an expert in getting fair deals for the stay-at-home spouse.

He went to Judith Nathanson, who has handled many such cases for women.

But she refused to take him as a client. He says she told him point blank that she didn't want to represent a man.

Nathanson defended this by saying that she had spent years building a practice that specialized in representing women in family and probate court. She said that it would undermine her "credibility" with the courts -- and women clients -- if she ever represented a man.

Men? Well, there goes the neighborhood.

Stropnick filed a complaint against her. Her defense is astounding -- and very revealing. She said she couldn't adequately defend

a client whom she didn't feel a "personal commitment" to, and that she felt such a commitment only toward women in divorce cases.

This is her defense! It amounts to an admission that she was biased against men. It's as if she expected society to understand and embrace her bigotry, to find that her bigotry was actually an excuse!

If you've dealt with feminists, you find that a number of them see absolutely nothing wrong in being bigoted against men. No one has taken them to task about it. Their feminist sisters overlook it, their bosses don't send them to "sensitivity training" because of it, our newspapers don't editorialize against it, companies don't get sued because of it.

Stropnick took his complaint to the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. It found that Nathanson broke the law by refusing service to him. She has been ordered to pay him \$5,000 in damages.

Decent.¹³⁶

Kill a Kid, Hit the Lecture Circuit

Tracy Ribitch, 19, admitted to causing the death of her newborn baby.

The baby was found with gauze stuffed in its mouth.

Paramedics found the baby stuffed into a bag.

Ribitch pleaded guilty to the crime.

How much jail time do you think she got?

Would ten years be too short for killing a defenseless infant?

How about five years?

How about one?

The answer, though, is none of the above.

Ribitch will never spend a day in jail for snuffing out a life.

She was sentenced to probation. And she will have to go around lecturing teens about safe sex.

Ribitch got a male judge who just didn't think it would do any good to send her to prison. As extenuating circumstances, Judge George Steeh Sr. of Macomb County, Michigan, blamed Ribitch's boyfriend for not being more involved with her while she was pregnant.

Okay, now how many of you could see this happening if the boyfriend killed the child? Do you think he'd get away scot free

* (You can browse Cecil's columns at;
<http://www.straightdope.com/>>)

on the grounds that his girlfriend wasn't more involved? Or would men in this society be expected to act responsibly, and to bear the consequences of their actions?

The most bizarre part of this sentence is that Ribitch has been ordered to perform 2,000 hours of community service lecturing teenagers about safe sex.

Kill a kid, hit the lecture circuit.

What the hell kind of lesson is anyone going to learn listening to this killer? That you can get away with murder? That if you cry enough in the courtroom, a male judge figures your victim doesn't deserve any rights?

Already there's one feminist arguing that this killer should not be sent to prison because she is not "a threat to society." Translation: "This woman doesn't seem like a threat to me. Round up any man I even vaguely suspect of abuse and lock him away, but don't worry about women who kill children, because they aren't any threat to me."

Well, pardon our outrage, but this woman is a threat to society. By her example, she shows that you can get away with murder. We wonder how many girls and women sitting in the audience listening to her will take note of how easy it is to get rid of an unwanted child. We wonder how many girls and women will realize that they can kill and get away with it.

And when they find themselves faced with that unwanted child, what's to stop these women from thinking "What have I got to lose?"¹³⁷

When is a Child Who is Not Your Child Your Child?

In the last item, we saw how a male is partly responsible when a woman kills if the man simply does nothing.

Now we'll see how a man is responsible when a woman cheats on him during marriage.

Question: When is a child who is not your child -- your child?

When you're a man who is ordered to pay child support for a child who is not yours.

Gerald Allan Miscovich divorced his wife in 1992. He suspected that the boy born during their marriage was really not his son. He got a DNA test that proved it.

He has been ordered to pay child support anyway.

For a child that is not his. For a child conceived because a woman was sneaking around during marriage.

It must have been a feminist judge who handed down this decision, right? After all, feminists will cite the number of males in any given organization to "prove" that the organization is biased in favor of men.

But the judge in this case is male. Judge Vincent A. Cirillo of the state Superior Court in Philadelphia, said that when a wife has an extramarital affair, "a child born to her enjoys the presumption of legitimacy absent clear and convincing proof of the husband's inability to procreate or lack of access to his wife at the time of conception."

And his presumption continues even when DNA shows it's not true.

Feminists will say that this is really about the "best interests of the child," not about who is responsible. But more and more that argument is a shield to protect the irresponsibility of women.

If this was about the best interest of the child, then why not seek support from the biological father? Well, then maybe the woman would have to let the man know he has a child. And then maybe she would have to share custody. Maybe she would actually (horrors) have to let the child have a father! Maybe she feels that a child needs a father like a fish needs a bicycle.

But the way the current arrangement works, the woman gets custody of her own child and support from a man who has no relationship with the child. She has the best of both worlds -- rights without responsibilities.

This child was conceived because this woman was screwing around on her husband. The government -- that grand Sugar Daddy -- then decides that she should be protected from her own actions. She should be free of responsibility. And since *she* is free of responsibility, the government has to go find a man to act responsibly.

This is the justice system that feminists claim is "biased" against them.¹³⁸

Taking Care of a Man

At Per's MANifesto, we take pride in giving you the stories that just somehow don't make it onto the front pages. For instance, here's one out of St. Cloud, Florida: A beard-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

ed figure stalks and kills an ex lover with four bullets to the chest. This was after an aggravated stalking charge and a warning for trespassing.

With all the ingredients for igniting a national outrage, why didn't this man's crime become a nationally publicized story?

Well, maybe because the killer wasn't a man.

She was Cheryl Vivier, who dressed like a man, including a fake beard, and tracked down ex-boyfriend George Long in January, killing him and then herself.

Just a week before her rampage, Vivier was charged with aggravated stalking, and four months earlier she had given a trespassing warning to stay away from Long's property.

Funny how these stories don't get national attention when a woman is doing it. Where is the outrage, the finger-pointing, the guilt-mongering that accompanies such stories when a man is the culprit? Why aren't women now being lectured that they should never joke about violence against men, that they are just as guilty if they indulge in anti-male attitudes? Where is the anger at the justice system for not restraining this woman?

"If it was a woman being stalked, it wouldn't have gotten this far," said Long's niece, Kina Rewis. "They think men can take care of themselves, but not when it's a psychotic woman involved."¹³⁹

Reach Out and Stalk Someone

Well, maybe the law couldn't stop Cheryl Vivier from killing George Long. But the law in Middleville, Michigan, wasn't going to let a male culprit get away with it.

Never mind that the male in question is ten years old.

A charge of stalking was brought in a juvenile petition filed in Barry County Probate Court in November after the parents of a girl said he left an "obscene" message on their answering machine.

Aren't telephones wonderful? If you can't be there to stalk someone in person, now you can reach out and stalk someone via the phone.

The boy's parents said the tape was fake.

And jurors took less than two hours to acquit the lad of the stalking charge.

Doesn't that strike fear into your hearts that this male has gone free? Why, right this minute he could be calling some defenseless tobacco shop to ask them if they have Prince Albert in a can.¹⁴⁰

Children Need Abusers?

Geoto Rivera, 22, shook her four-year-old child to death.

She was convicted of involuntary manslaughter in the killing of her child, Alize, a year ago.

Now the Philadelphia woman is asking the judge for leniency.

Her reasoning: she wants to be let out of prison so she can care for her newborn.

That doesn't sound like such a swell deal for the newborn.

We wonder if carjackers ask for leniency on the grounds that there are cars that need taking care of.¹⁴¹

Justice has Very Poor Ames

Four students were recently charged with taking part in an unauthorized campus rally at Iowa State University in Ames.

Three of them have been barred from holding campus office. They are male.

The fourth received only a written reprimand. She is female.

University officials say the stricter punishments for the men were fair.

ISU Dean of Students Kathlene MacKay said the punishment of Thomas was different because of different evidence. "There's a standard, absolutely strict protocol by which we handle the evidence. That doesn't mean each outcome is going to be the same," MacKay said.

But they were all found guilty. Different standards of evidence might account for different verdicts. But why do identical verdicts result in different punishments?¹⁴²

Court Orders Domestic Violence

Question: Our justice system is supposed to prevent domestic violence, right?

Answer: Not in Minden, Nevada.

There, District Judge Dave Gamble orders that domestic violence be carried out in his courtroom.

Oh, but don't worry. It's not a woman being hit, so it doesn't count.

Instead, the judge ordered a woman to hit her child.

The boy had been previously charged with stealing candy and a compact disc player, and throwing rocks through windows. But the offense that brought him to Gamble's courtroom was an accusation of using foul language and making obscene gestures to a schoolyard attendant.

Gamble ordered the mother to spank the boy in court. Then he made the boy get up in front of the press and spectators and describe how it felt to be spanked in public.

The boy said he felt embarrassed.

The real embarrassment, though, is Judge Gamble.

Why did he think that the best, most therapeutic treatment for a boy like this is to be struck and humiliated? Would he order a similar punishment for a girl who made obscene gestures?

Some people think that violence teaches a valuable lesson, that smacking people around is the best way to instill morality, honesty, and thoughtfulness.

So maybe we should try it on the judge.¹⁴³

Can I Have My Blood Money Back, Please

Maybe you heard this joke after the O.J. Simpson trial. Question: What did Simpson say after he was acquitted? Answer: "Can I have my hat and gloves back, please?"

Well, reality just outstripped fiction again.

Angela Petrole was recently charged with attempted murder, accused of giving a hit man \$1,000 to kill a witness against her son.

She was acquitted.

So then asked for the money back.

Petrole's defense argued that her son had arranged for her to give the money to a supposed hit man, who was supposed to rub out a witness in her son's trial on a separate attempted murder charge. But the "hit man" turned out to be an undercover agent, and Ms. Petrole was arrested and charged with attempted murder.

At her trial in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, she claimed she really didn't know that the money was for a hit man. She thought she was merely paying to have the witness "roughed up" a little.

The jury declared her innocent.

And then she asked for her money back.¹⁴⁴

Cosmowatch

(Due to this issue's longer-than-usual length, we had to bump Cosmowatch. It will return next issue.)

Humor:

POW Condemns Good Friday

All right-thinking people must reject the Eurocentric view of history promoted with the concept of "Good Friday," says the Propaganda Organization for Women.

"The fact is, all Fridays are equally valid," says Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of POW. "However, so-called Western 'civilization' has attempted to promote one Friday as supreme above all others. We find it curious, therefore, that this supposedly 'Good Friday' just happens to coincide with a major holiday in the European patriarchal religion. Coincidence? We think not.

"If you look at other cultures," says Ms. Hyphenated-Lastname, "you realize that many of them also have holidays associated with Fridays. Declaring the European holiday to be the one 'Good Friday' thus demeans and denigrates all other cultural Fridays and relegates them to second-class status. We will not stand for this, and we will begin our fight against it as soon as the weekend is over."

"We uphold the diversity of all Fridays, not just the one Friday valued by the phalocentric religion of dead white European males," says Ms. Hyphenated-Lastname. "However, we do feel that there is room for a feminist reinterpretation of 'Good Friday.' Our research has shown that it seems to have something to do with a man being executed. Therefore it doesn't look like the holiday is entirely bad."¹⁴⁵

APRIL 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue we might have called "The Rape of Reason." But instead we'll call it "Destroying Democracy?" Did you know you're helping to destroy democracy just by reading this right now? Sure you are, according to some peo-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

ple who have a stake in preserving the status quo. Read on.*

Predators and Prey

In the May 1996 MANifesto, we told you about another influential feminist study being debunked -- Lenore J. Weitzman's questionable "Divorce Revolution" study. It purported to show that divorce hurled a huge percentage of women into poverty while improving the status of men. There were questions raised about that study from the beginning, but for some reason the major news media gladly ignored the questions -- and the other studies that contradicted Weitzman. Weitzman's study added the phrase "the feminization of poverty" to the lexicon and influenced court decisions and governmental policy. Then it turned out that Weitzman herself admitted that her study was wrong. The people who questioned her study from the get-go had been right -- and they had been brushed aside.

Did the news media learn anything from this? Not at all. They've continued to take their "studies" on gender issues from the feminists. And the studies often turn out to be morally and intellectually corrupt.

That's why Per's MANifesto is a valuable source for finding out what's really going on. When feminist studies turn out to be bogus, it just doesn't seem to attract the same attention the studies got when they were first touted. Because it has happened again.

A while back, social agencies that deal with teen pregnancy began reporting "anecdotal evidence" that up to half of all teen pregnancies were due to statutory rape. It was, they said, a problem of adult men in their 20s and 30s or older seducing very young girls and then abandoning them.

This appealed to the natural instinct to protect girls, and to the familiar image of men as sexual predators. It wasn't just feminists who hopped on the bandwagon. There also were conservative male lawmakers with Victorian views of females as naive waifs in need of protection from bestial men. These forces joined together to demand that we start enforcing statutory rape laws and jailing the S.O.B.s who were seducing the flow-

er of our fair young womanhood. Congress even demanded a crackdown on statutory rape as part of welfare reform.

In all the uproar, no one really stopped to examine the evidence being advanced for all these claims. For one thing, the evidence was anecdotal. For another, many social-service agencies reporting this "evidence" were staffed with activists who had an axe to grind. And -- is this still surprising? -- their axes were often aimed straight at the neck of the male gender. The tip-off should have come as these activists raved about the male "predators." That suggests an atmosphere loaded with anti-male stereotypes even as they started collecting their evidence.

Now, imagine that you are a pregnant teenage girl, and your counselor is pumping you to find out if the father was one of these "predators." Obviously, a lot of teenage girls could realize they could pass the buck by claiming to be victims of statutory rape. It shifts the responsibility off them, and it tells the counselors what they want to hear, thus getting the counsel off their backs. Is this so hard to predict? We've seen girls send innocent men to prison on false rape charges because the girls thought they were pregnant.

Well, someone finally did take a tough look at all this anecdotal evidence about statutory rape. And guess what? They found the claim that half of teen pregnancies were due to statutory rape to be a wild exaggeration, and the claims of abandonment as well.

The new study, conducted by researchers from the Urban Institute, found that only 8 percent of all births to 15- to 19-year-olds would be covered by statutory rape laws. "Nearly two thirds of all teenagers who have babies are 18 or 19 years old, too old to be covered by statutory rape laws in any state," the study says.

As reported in the Washington Post, the study found that "some of the fathers were only a year or two older than the teenage mothers. Statutory rape laws typically require a five-year age difference between the mother and father, according to Laura Lindberg, one of four co-authors of the report to be published today in Family Planning Per-

* MANifesto is now on the Web, at:
<<http://shell.idt.net/~per2/manifest.htm>>

spectives. Also, some of the couples were married when the child was born."^{*}

Once again we have the anti-male forces playing fast and loose with the statistics. Sure you can say that a 20-year-old man sleeping with a 19-year-old woman is technically an adult male sleeping with a "teenager" (though it's a teenager who can vote.) Then you can take that kernel of truth and blow it up into an epidemic, rephrasing it so it sounds like lots of (older) men sleeping with lots of (younger) teenagers.

The Post said the new study "also challenged the popular perception that large numbers of older men are taking advantage of vulnerable young girls and then abandoning them to be cared for by the nation's welfare system. Less than 2 percent of all adult men father a child with a teenage girl, Lindberg said, and half of the minors who had an adult partner were still living with him as long as 30 months after the birth of their child. This suggests that the men were not impregnating the girls and walking out."

We know what some feminists will say to all this: that grown men should not be fooling around with young teenage girls. We *absolutely agree.* But we are not going to fix our real problems by chasing imaginary or exaggerated ones. Is feminism interested in looking at the real problem, or just in bashing men? Studies show that many girls who grow up without fathers are more promiscuous and start having sex at earlier ages. They're looking for the love they've missed. The answer is making sure that our children have loving and complete families.

When some feminists start spreading the rumor that there is an epidemic of male predators preying on young teenage girls, it might launch those feminists into that high level of outrage and moral superiority they crave so much. Problem is, it doesn't help anyone, and it just further poisons the air between women and men. It merely feeds the anti-male feminist's sense of self-righteousness. And some feminists seem more interested in complaining than in fixing real problems.¹⁴⁶

Punishing a Responsible Man

After reading the previous article, some feminists and their supporters might shrug and say: "What's the harm? So what if the original studies weren't all that accurate? Are we hurting anyone?"

You might ask Kevin Gillson of Port Washington, Wisconsin.

When Kevin Gillson found out that his girlfriend was pregnant, he did what countless men do across the country without attracting any headlines: he acted responsibly.

Gillson, who is 18, set out to marry his girlfriend, get a job, and support his family.

Is this a crime?

According to the justice system in Wisconsin, it is.

Police found out that Gillson's girlfriend is 15 years old. The law says that sex with anyone under 16 is statutory rape.

Well surely they'd just warn Gillson and let him go, right? After all, he was getting married and supporting his family, wasn't he?

Sure. But feminists will tell you there's a "rape epidemic" going on, and we can't let them get away with it.

So Gillson was arrested, put on trial, and convicted. He faces sentencing of probation to 40 years in prison. (Yes, 4 followed by zero.) His girlfriend even tearfully pleaded that the sex was consensual and that she was marrying him. To no avail.

And Gillson will have to register from now on as a convicted sex offender.

Gillson is free on bail pending sentencing June 24.

The Ozaukee County District Attorney is a woman, Sandy Williams. She defends her efforts to put a man behind bars after he marries the woman he supposedly "raped." "Does it mean that because he said he's sorry, we're supposed to close our eyes to it?" she asks.

Well, that's sort of what was done with Tracy Ribitch.

We discussed Ribitch's case in the last issue of MANifesto.

She killed her newborn child, and was sentenced to not one day in prison. Her sentence was to go on the lecture circuit telling other teens about the perils of unprotected sex.

^{*} (See "Statutory Rape-Pregnancy Link Reassessed: Crackdown Will Have Limited Impact on Births to Teens, Study Says, in the *Washington Post*, April 16, page A3.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Of course there are major differences between these cases.

Gillson assumed responsibility for his actions and tried to make good. Ribitch assumed no responsibility for killing someone, and blamed her boyfriend for not being supportive.

Oh, and Gillson's crime was to love someone. Ribitch, however, killed someone.

Obviously, the man has to pay.

Feminists, just keep repeating to yourselves: "Society is biased against women, society is biased against women ..."¹⁴⁷

Their Choice, our Responsibility

Speaking of responsibility: the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that "pregnant women are drinking harder than they did four years earlier, raising the risk their babies will suffer mental retardation, learning disorders and other problems," according to an Associated Press report.

The study "found that 3.5 percent of 1,313 moms-to-be in 1995 admitted they had seven or more drinks per week or binged on five or more drinks at once within the previous month. That's up from 0.8 percent of 1,053 pregnant women in 1991."

"The sample suggests that 140,000 pregnant women nationwide were frequent drinkers in 1995, compared with 32,000 women in 1991."

Many feminists insist that it is "her body, her choice," and men have to "get their hands off women's wombs."

Unfortunately, her choice has consequences for us all.

First, there's the consequences for children who are damaged by their mother's drinking. They are sentenced to a lifetime of punishment for the mother's "choice."

And these children often need care throughout their lives, never living up to the potential that was taken from them. Your money and ours goes for medical care, treatment, and programs they will need. These women exercising their "choice" create a burden that we all have to pay.

And we don't have a choice about it.¹⁴⁸

Destroying Democracy?

Recently, TV journalist Cokie Roberts and her husband, Steven, warned about the grave

dangers of the internet. It could, they said, destroy democracy.

How touching for aristocrats of the air-waves and newspapers to be so concerned for democracy. Tell me, fellows, is Cokie known for giving your views a democratic airing on her broadcasts?

In a syndicated column, they start right off with the stereotypes from the first: "Cyber seduction, cult by computer, kids caught in an indecent web! The headlines have been scary of late as we learn more about the dangers of the brave new world of the Internet." The Robertses know that one sure way to get people to make emotional reactions is to scare them about their kids. It worked for Gloria Steinem in the satanic panics over the supposed cults in daycare centers. It's sure to work for the Robertses.

"The horrible thought that, in the privacy of your own home, your child could be the target of some sick predator was frightening enough," they say as they try to suggest that the uniform for every net user is the flasher's trenchcoat. Sure it's horrible to think that right in your home your child could be the target of some sick predator bent on twisting the kids to their own purposes. So turn off the TV.

We all know there's junk on the net. There's junk on TV, too. The problem is when kids aren't supervised. The Robertses want to scare you about the net. Why?

Obviously hoping that their contrived chills will get others shuddering, they say that supporters tout the net "like an electronic town meeting. That analogy makes our blood run cold. Remember, that was Ross Perot's big idea. Let's just all get together, via computer, and let the politicians know what we want, so then they will do it! No more pandering to the big contributors, no more deals between members, just the voice of the people will be heard! We hear that and shudder. To us it sounds like no more deliberation, no more consideration of an issue over a long period of time, no more balancing of regional and ethnic interests, no more protection of minority views."^{*}

^{*} You can see the rest of this pap at:
<<http://www.essential.org/listproc/info-policy-notes/0257.html>>

Their concern for protecting minority views certainly is touching. Always nice to see a white woman saying that protecting minority views requires that she keep her seven-figure salary. But can Cokie claim to be protecting the views of people who disagree with elitist and feminist views? Sure she can. She's got them safely locked up and hidden off camera. How safe can you get?

And that's what's really at issue here. The Robertses are media stars, and they want to keep it that way. Cokie's a fixture on ABC News' "This Week," Steven wrote for the New York Times and U.S. News & World Report. They make a lot of money. And, with the positions they've been in, they often get to decide what gets covered and what doesn't -- and how it gets covered, who gets a chance to speak, what emotions get manipulated, whose "spin" gets passed along as the latest study.

People who are protecting their own power base start telling us that the upstarts who threaten them are dangerous. Of *course* they're dangerous. Take any clout away from Cokie and she might have to drive the same Volvo two years in a row.

People who control access to information want to keep it that way. Once upon a time, the Bible was available only in Latin, and Latin was available only to the elite.

For translating the Bible into English, Oxford scholar John Wycliffe was condemned as "the very herald and child of anti-Christ, who crowned his wickedness by translating the Scriptures into the mother tongue." Sort of like the Robertses trying to convince us that the net is in the grip of religious cults.

The established powers were all for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the commoners. Bible translator William Tyndale was burned at the stake. Pope Innocent III said "the secret mysteries of the faith ought not to be explained to all men in all places, since they cannot be everywhere understood by all men." Pope Gregory VII supported the ban, saying translations "might be falsely understood by those of mediocre learning, and lead to error." Like these clerics, the Robertses can cite all sorts of noble-sounding arguments against the net. And as with the clerics, it's a smokescreen. They don't want to dilute their own influence. This isn't about what benefits society. It's about

what benefits the Robertses and those like them.

We're touched by the Robertses dedication to democracy, but we have to wonder if it matches Cokie's dedication to truth. A while back, Cokie was supposed to deliver a report from in front of the Capitol building, but for some reason she couldn't get there. So she stepped in front of a big blow-up picture of the Capitol and faked it. Someone noticed that it was cold outside and it would look funny for Cokie to be standing at the Capitol without a coat.

So she put on her coat to further reinforce the deception.

If Cokie thinks the net is a threat to democracy, she's having as much trouble understanding the concept of democracy as she does understanding the concept of truth in journalism.¹⁴⁹

Feedback on Harassment Comments

In last January's edition of Per's MANifesto, we discussed an article on employers who overreact to sexual harassment charges. The story quoted attorney Rita Risser, a principal in Fair Measures, a workplace training and advisory firm in Santa Cruz, Calif. "Some organizations will tolerate gross harassment -- rape, stalking, attempted murder -- and won't do anything, but other organizations will fire someone for doing something minor ..." We thought it odd that companies would tolerate attempted murder, and we said so.

Ms. Risser found MANifesto while surfing the net and asked for a chance to reply. So we're about to "destroy democracy" again by actually giving her space to respond and clarify her views. She sent the following item to Per's MANifesto. It is reprinted in its entirety. Her remarks are in quotes, and our replies are set off by the word **REPLY**:

Setting the Record Straight on Sexual Harassment

By Rita Risser

"I am an attorney who has specialized in sexual harassment law since 1981. As an attorney, I have represented both male and female victims of harassment, men accused of harassment, and companies defending such claims. As a business owner for almost 20 years, I have handled harassment claims among my employees, and have been accused

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

of harassment by employees. As a high school student, I experienced harassment from an employer. For the past eight years, I have conducted over 500 training programs on harassment for managers and employees in companies throughout the U.S. I have a web site devoted to employment law issues which includes harassment, and I have just completed a study of all of the federal Court of Appeals decisions on harassment written since November, 1993 (the time of the last U.S. Supreme Court case).

"An article in Per's Manifesto (Jan. 1997) recently described as 'bizarre' a quote from me in the Washington Post in which I said that some organizations 'tolerate' attempted murder, stalking and rape. Per challenged me to back this up. I cite the case of *Fuller v. City of Oakland, Cal.*, 47 F.3d 1522 (9th Cir., 1995)

"In this case, a woman police officer was harassed by a fellow officer. He followed her on numerous occasions, obtained her phone number illegally from personnel files every time she changed it to avoid him, and one time pinned her against her car until she would give him her number. One day, she was driving her boyfriend (another police officer) when the harasser came speeding at them in an unmarked police car. She was forced to swerve to avoid a head-on collision.

"This is properly characterized as attempted murder. In order to prove murder, it is not necessary to show intent to kill, only that a person was killed because the perpetrator acted with malice aforethought.

"However, the woman did not report this incident or any other incidents because she was afraid for her physical safety. Other officers reported the incident and an Internal Affairs investigation was begun. Two months later, the 'investigation' was closed due to 'lack of evidence,' even though the investigating officer had not talked to the accused, the boyfriend who witnessed the incident, or any other witnesses.

"In my opinion, this is 'tolerating attempted murder.'"

REPLY: Some people might see this as "tolerating" attempted murder. The word "tolerating" makes it sound as if the police force had no objection. But, from the details you supply, it appears they could not prove the case one way or the other. This seems more like tolerance for due process. If the officer indeed was guilty, we sincerely hope he is punished. We also hope that society does not start punishing people on the basis of accusations that cannot be proven. One drawback to this system is that sometimes

the guilty get away. But in the long run, it protects all our rights. And, because false accusations do occur, we need those rights now more than ever.

You say: "In order to prove murder, it is not necessary to show intent to kill, only that a person was killed because the perpetrator acted with malice aforethought." We note that, since no one was killed, murder obviously wasn't proven.

There is a serious dilemma in cases like this. If the charge is true, then you've got to do something to stop the dangerous person. But how do you know the charge is true? If the answer is to automatically jail any man as soon as a woman accuses him, then sure, that will protect a lot of women. It will also mean a lot of women will figure out that they can get immediate action with a false claim.

Rita Risser continues:

"Tolerating rape? How about *Tomka v. Seiler Corp.*, 66 F.3d 1295 (2nd Cir., 1995) where a woman was gang raped by three of her managers. She did not come in to work the next day (or ever again), but called in to report the rape. The employer investigated by talking to one of the men, who said she consented. The employer then closed the "investigation," without ever talking to her in person, talking to the other perpetrators, or asking themselves, "Hmmm, would a reasonable person voluntarily agree to have group sex with three managers? Or might there have been an abuse of physical and/or managerial power here?"

REPLY: To that, we reply, "Is every woman reasonable?"

We certainly wouldn't make the claim that every man is reasonable. Not with so many male feminists out there.

We could look at the situation as "every woman is reasonable, and no reasonable woman agrees to group sex, therefore this is rape." But some women do agree to group sex. And some reasonable people do things they are later embarrassed about, especially if they had been drinking at the time. After you've seen enough cases of girls sending an innocent man to prison on a false rape charge because the girls feared they were pregnant by their boyfriends, you know that some will claim rape to protect their reputations. Could it be possible that one of the

participants began talking about the episode and the woman decided to say it was rape?

We are also bothered by the phrase "talking to the other perpetrators." Calling the men "perpetrators" seems to presume they are guilty. Until we decide that a rape accusation equals a rape conviction, we have to fall back on that tired, clichéd, unfashionable old idea of innocent until proven guilty. We are open to the suspicion that these men are guilty. But we're also open to the suspicion they are innocent.

Rita Risser continues:

"Many of these cases are "she said/he said" claims. That does not make them inherently unbelievable. Many cases go to trial on the basis of one person's word against another, such as mugging, robbery, car-jacking, assault and battery, or where there are no eyewitnesses (e.g. O.J. Simpson). Employers have a duty to investigate; and if they don't, they are tolerating the behavior."

REPLY: It looks like they did investigate, though. If the investigation was deliberately shoddy or incomplete, that's wrongdoing on the part of the company. But we'd need evidence that that was the case, too. (We're sticklers.) As for shoddy investigations, remind us to tell you sometime how we were treated for reporting a hostile working environment by some fire-breathing feminists.

Rita Risser continues:

"I very much agree with Per and others who say that employers often overreact to claims of sexual harassment that clearly are not harassment. But it is also true that some employers fail to conduct reasonable investigations of claims of serious violations."

"The courts since 1993 have significantly limited the definition of illegal harassment. This has given me the ability to go back to my clients and train the people in personnel and Human Resources to stop overreacting to claims of "harassment" which are based on no more than personality conflicts, politically incorrect speech or common courtesies (such as opening doors). The pendulum is swinging back, and publications such as the Manifesto can help by publicizing this fact."

REPLY: Thank you, Rita, for a thought-provoking discussion of the issues backed up by facts. We don't agree with all of your conclusions, but we respect your work and your willingness to communicate. Good luck.¹⁵⁰

More Stupid Law Tricks

Here's an item we intended to include in our "Stupid Law Tricks" issue.

9-year-old Jeremy Anderson of Las Vegas was arrested and strip-searched. The charge: writing name in wet cement.

Jeremy says he was walking home with friends when a construction worker invited them to write their names in a sidewalk of fresh cement. So they did.

Then the contractor called his family demanding \$11,000 to redo the work. They didn't pay, and in January he was arrested. In Nevada, 8-year-olds can be arrested, and property crimes over \$5,000 are considered felonies. So Jeremy, who has won citizenship awards at his elementary school, was booked and strip-searched.

The story got remarkably little coverage, and even then it seemed as though the strip-searching of a boy was fodder for humor.¹⁵¹

Ethics Watchdogs

We've heard all the rhetoric about how women would clean up government and provide a more moral, caring leadership. In other words "women good-men bad, so vote for the woman."

This was a form of man-bashing -- implying that men are less honest and that women are morally superior. In fact Senator Christopher Dodd, head of the Democratic National Committee and a major player in President Clinton's reelection bid, pandered shamelessly to that anti-male stereotype. "Women are more inclined to think less of themselves and their own immediate needs and more of their families." That translates into broader support of a government role in guaranteeing things like education and health care, he said, hoping that pandering to such women-are-superior rhetoric would help keep men like him in office.

So from time to time, Per's MANifesto likes to take a look at the moral leadership that women are providing. After all, if

* "More information about my research report, tape and video on 'The New Law of Sexual Harassment: Everything You Know is Wrong' can be obtained at: <<http://www.fairmeasures.com>>"

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

they're going to sell us that bill of goods, we ought to check it over.

Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez is accused of stealing her seat through vote fraud, by registering non-citizens and having them vote for her. Sanchez defeated a fire-breathing conservative, Congressman

"B-1" Bob Dornan. Many liberals are so delighted that Dornan was ousted that they don't seem to mind the methods that were used in doing so.

And there is mounting evidence that Democrat Mary Landrieu stole the U.S. Senate election in Louisiana, a state famous for its ballot-box chicanery. Among the evidence: Her opponent has gathered testimony from people saying they were paid to vote for Landrieu, sometimes more than once. However, Democrats on the Senate Rules Committee are refusing to even look at the evidence -- see no evil, hear no evil. (See Robert Novak's column "We're Going to Louisiana" in the April 24th Washington Post, page A25.)

And what sort of moral leadership is feminist Senator Dianne Feinstein providing on the Landrieu election? Is she holding to that high moral standard that we were told women politicians would bring to office?

Nope. She's right down there in the mud with the big boys, bashing men in her efforts to defend her fellow member of the Senate good-old-girls club. When evidence is presented that Landrieu stole the election, Feinstein sneers that "hell hath no fury like a man beaten by a woman."

Lots of MANifesto readers are used to that reaction from feminists on the internet. If you object to being discriminated against, bashed, smeared, threatened, or censored, it's really your fault because you're a "backlasher." According to Feinstein, the only reason to object to evidence of government positions being stolen and the will of the people being voided is that you're somehow against women. Take note. This ripe bit of hypocrisy is not just the trait of a few whacko feminists on the net, as some claim. It's a trait of a feminist right at the top of the heap. If you object to your job being stolen, it's just because you're trying to keep women down.

And lastly, let's look at Valerie Lau, the Treasury Department Inspector General. She is accused of awarding a no-bid contract to a

longtime associate -- someone who just happened to recommend her for the job to begin with.

So she gets the job, and he gets the contract.

Oh, and do you know what Lau's job as Inspector General is?

She's the Treasury Department's ethics watchdog.

We've said it before and we'll say it again. Women really are equal to men.¹⁵²

Humor:

POW Demands Parity with Hostages in Peru

The government of Peru, the Japanese Embassy in Lima, and all officials who took part in the hostage situation there should be condemned for their sexism and take steps to atone, says Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women.

"We know that men hold all the power," said Hyphenated-Lastname. "And all of the hostages inside the compound were men. Why were women systematically shut out from this center of power? Any time you see a group made up solely of men, you can be sure that discrimination against women is the cause. The Propaganda Organization for Women must insist that society set up special hostage-mentoring programs for women to make up for this injustice.

"We cannot overstress the damage that has been done to women by refusing to let them be hostages. It sends women the message that their lives were not considered valuable enough to be held as ransom. And it meant that, as in so many other areas of life, women were shortchanged of the valuable life experience and the contacts they might have acquired while being held captive.

"History shows that women were originally full members of the party in December at the Japanese compound in Lima. In that early time, before sexism, women did an equal share of the work in attending the party, and they even held high positions. But then men took over the compound and women were systematically excluded by the patriarchy, supposedly for their own 'protection.'

"We are sure that many of the women wanted to stay on as hostages and face the dangers right along with the men. Unfortunately, the men would not let them. Besides, many of these women had to drive their kids to soccer practice.

"To make up for this past injustice, we now demand that women be given preference in entering the Japanese compound and holding positions there. We can start by having Japan name a woman to be its next ambassador. We were shocked to see that the current ambassador -- a man, of course -- had to be carried from the compound on a stretcher. Obviously they're willing to let any old sick person be an ambassador just so long as he has a penis.

"The Propaganda Organization for Women regrets that we were not quicker in demanding that more women be present in the compound. Some people might be suspicious of our timing -- just when the hostage situation ended. The timing is merely coincidental, and anyone who disagrees really just wants to keep women down.

"Besides, POW was distracted by some urgent business. We have recently heard rumors that some woman named Paula Jones has accused President Clinton of something or other. We intend to give the matter our fullest and complete attention sometime in the next millennium."¹⁵³

MAY 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue we'll call "Flinn Flam." It's about getting off the hook by blaming men for your actions. The method has been tried, tested, and approved by the U.S. Air Force. Read on:

Flinn Flam

Former Air Force lieutenant Kelly Flinn has shown the nation the two steps to getting special treatment:

1. Claim you are unfairly targeted because you're a woman.
2. Blame your actions on men.

Flinn, the nation's first and only female B-52 pilot, had faced prison time and a dishonorable discharge for sexual misconduct, disobeying orders and making a false state-

ment. Instead, after a successful (and man-bashing) publicity campaign, she is getting an extremely light sentence -- leaving the military with a general discharge and no prison time.

Flinn claimed she was being persecuted for having a love affair with a man she thought was separated from his wife. She claimed that men in the service get away with similar flings. Flinn has been conjugating the verbs "lay" and "lie," with interesting results.

At times, some factions of the news media seemed to function almost as Flinn's public relations agent. In recapping the case, they reprinted her claims as facts -- for example, stating as an established fact that she didn't know her lover was married.

When the truth began to come out, it didn't seem to damage Flinn popularity (especially with the news media.) It turned out that Flinn knew darn well that the man she was sleeping with was married. And in fact she had been given the opportunity to "get away" with her hanky-panky if she'd just cease doing it. When her superiors learned about her affairs, they didn't punish her. They merely ordered her to stay away from Marc Zigo, the married man she was sleeping with. If she had done so, she never would have been punished. (Flinn also had sex with an enlisted man, an unmarried senior airman.)

But Flinn knowingly disobeyed that direct order, even moving in with Zigo. Then she lied to her superiors to cover up her refusal to follow orders.

That's when Flinn was charged -- not just because she committed adultery. She was very successful in painting this as a woman being unfairly punished for having sex when men, supposedly, would be let off. But the affair was actually one of the lesser charges against her. Adultery could have gotten her one year in prison. But the charge of making a false statement could have gotten her five years. And her other affair with Senior Airman Colin C. Thompson violated the ban on fraternization: penalty two years.

Flinn piloted B-52 bombers equipped with nuclear weapons. This is a position of extreme responsibility in which it is imperative that the crew obey orders. Flinn had under her command the power to destroy cities and

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

launch nuclear war. Society has every right to expect that people in that position will obey orders. When you are carrying a cargo of death, obeying orders should not be an option.

But Flinn was very good at avoiding responsibility and passing it on to men. In a letter to the Air Force pleading for special treatment, she said she "fell deeply in love with a man who led me down this path of self-destruction and career destruction" and said she will suffer for it forever.

If her statement is true, then she certainly should have been discharged. People who are so easily misled into dereliction of duty should not be in positions of trust -- much less flying nuclear weapons.

But we feel that Flinn's contention that a man "led me down this path of self-destruction" is really a self-serving plea for victimhood. She wants a man to take the rap for her actions -- a civilian man at that. To escape responsibility for her own actions, she plays the wide-eyed innocent being duped by the evil Svengali. Her brother, Don Flinn Jr., played that game, too. "She's been abused in her relationship. She's been abused in the system," he told a press conference. Flinn's family got positively Victorian in her defense, saying that her lover had "taken advantage of her." That's a quaint old phrase used when a woman gets into bed and then wants to claim purity.

But, as her lover, Marc Zigo wryly noted, "At no time was a gun to Lieutenant Flinn's head."

As part of her training as the nation's first female B-52 pilot, Flinn got training in handling the news media, and she played them like a harp. Flinn also had an advantage because the others in the case were holding their comments for the trial, at which time it would have been seen how much Flinn had lied.

But Flinn's tactic of blaming the man and crying victim worked. When it seemed apparent she wouldn't go to trial, only then did the other figures speak out publicly. They included Marc Zigo's wife, Airman Gayla A. Zigo. In a letter to Air Force Secretary Sheila Widnall, Gayla Zigo wrote: "On several occasions, I came home from work and found her at my house with Marc. ... Lt. Flinn knew we were married and not sepa-

rated, but that did not stop her. I am tired of Lt. Flinn acting as if she is the victim ... Lt. Flinn knew exactly what she was doing and that it was wrong!"

Flinn was also not being truthful when she claimed that she was being singled out as a woman for offenses that men get away with. But Air Force officials note that right there on the same base with Flinn, there have been other officers of the same rank who have gone to prison for offenses like Flinn's.

And the Associated Press reported that Air Force figures show that 60 men and seven women were prosecuted on adultery charges last year. There were, in fact, far more men than women punished.

U.S. Rep. Sam Johnson, a Texas Republican and a decorated fighter pilot, said Flinn's punishment was too lenient. Johnson is a former military prosecutor who prosecuted many men on similar charges. "I supported the secretary of the Air Force in her original decision to court-martial. Today, I am disappointed in her decision to change that," Johnson said. "It appears to me that (Widnall) has caved to political pressure from the Senate."

That's interesting that the Senate actually had the backbone to stand up and demand leniency in this case. In the past, the Senate has completely caved in on the Navy's Tailhook scandal. Due to political pressure, 133 men were put on a secret list containing rumors and unproven accusations of misconduct at Tailhook. One notable case involved Cmdr. Robert Stumpf, a Navy "top gun" fighter pilot. The accusations against Stumpf boil down to his presence in a room where a stripper performed. He was cleared of all other charges. But his promotion has been derailed and his career ruined simply because his name was on that list.

Each time a man who was on the list came up for promotion, the promotion was denied. The man didn't have to be guilty of anything. The congressional committees responsible for approving their promotions were too terrified of being accused of being lenient on Tailhook. So they trashed any man even vaguely accused, in order to protect their own careers.

Supporters of Flinn argued that it was a waste to discharge her after all the money the military had spent on training her. But

the military spent a lot of money training all the men blacklisted because of Tailhook. Cmdr. Stumpf was driven out of the Navy because of it. His case didn't receive one tenth the publicity of the crafty and manipulative Flinn.

Instead of a court-martial and up to nine and a half years in prison, she is "out like Flinn," getting a general discharge, a mild form of discipline. Flinn must repay 20 percent of her Air Force Academy education -- about \$18,000. But the military trained her in flying aircraft, and she's already gotten offers to fly for commercial airlines -- meaning her \$18,000 repayment will equal one or two month's salary. Most people coming out of college can't pay their student loans so easily. Plus, Flinn is generating talk of book deals and movies. For a woman who claims to have destroyed and treated unfairly, she's doing remarkably well.

Why should *you* care about Flinn's case?

Because it rewards and encourages man-bashing.

Flinn claimed she was being singled out as a woman and was getting harsher treatment than men. The facts show that men have been punished for such offenses, and far more severely than Flinn. But Flinn appealed to an anti-male stereotype by claiming to be a victim of sexist good-old-boys in the military. Flinn showed the nation that when you are caught doing wrong, you can cry sexism and get away with it.

And Flinn tried to blame a man for her own offenses. That's man-bashing. And it worked.

Flinn's great success with man-bashing all but guarantees that others will follow suit. What do they have to lose? Man-bashing paid off for Flinn, without any downside. The message has gone out: when caught red-handed, cry sexism, bash men, and get away with it. You can expect man-bashing accusations like Flinn's to increase. That's a major factor in this case that the news media have ignored.

Whether the Air Force's codes on sexual conduct need to be reviewed is another matter. Some say they are antiquated. Others note that military families face long separations and other strains unique to military life. Adultery can hurt soldier's morale, and

hence their preparedness -- and because of that, the fallout from adultery is a valid concern for the military. We can see both sides to these arguments. But our interest is in Flinn's use of man-bashing to evade responsibility. Now that Flinn has demonstrated how well man-bashing pays off, what is to stop others from following suit?

So let's add a new word to the language: Flinn flam.

Flinn flam: (verb) to seek or attain special treatment by claiming you are being treated unfairly; to blame men for your lack of responsibility.

Flinn flam (adjective) denoting the act of blaming others for your transgressions; denoting one who feels that anything less than special treatment is unfair; or, in general, denoting a feminist¹⁵⁴

Being Nice to the Bigots

Recently, a man writing on the Usenet committed about man-bashing: "for my part, I think that the best thing to do when a group I'm a part of is being criticized, is to work to dispel such a myth: i.e. don't be a pig, treat women, or indeed everyone, with some respect and courtesy, try to accommodate for other people when necessary."

The problem with this approach is you don't have to do anything bad to be targeted by bigots. For example, we have never raped anyone, but that doesn't stop many feminists from saying "all men are potential rapists." The stereotype does not depend on our behavior -- it depends on the outlook of the person doing the stereotyping.

And simply being a good little boy is not going to change the people who hold such stereotypes. Bigots don't look for the good examples. They look for the bad examples to confirm their prejudices. The good examples get ignored or finessed away.

This man's approach -- "don't be a pig, treat women ... with some respect ..." isn't going to do anything about the root causes of bigotry, because the root causes of bigotry are in the bigot. You can live your life as a saint and still many feminists will regard you as a potential rapist or a member of the "patriarchy."

Many feminists have managed an amazing feat of manipulation: as feminists grow increasingly and blatantly bigoted, some

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

men feel they have to bend over backward to prove they're nice guys. This is rewarding bigotry. It only encourages feminists to become more anti-male in their outlook, because they know they can manipulate some men in trying even harder to please the feminists.

This fellow also said: "of course any group is bound to be stereotypee at any one time. a woman who is stereotyping men is most likely just angry or frustrated for a short amount of time. Most times she's more frustrated then serious."

But modern feminism, going back to the women's liberation movement of the 1960s, has been preaching anti-male opinions for more than a "short amount of time." These anti-male attitudes have intensified and have been taken up by a second wave of feminists who, if anything, are more anti-male than their women's-lib predecessors.

As for male sportscasters and others who have been punished for allegedly making sexist comments -- no feminist stepped forward to defend them on the grounds that the comments were sexist for "a short amount of time." The fellow quoted here is preaching for tolerance and acceptance of anti-male attitudes, while feminists are hardly in the habit of advocating tolerance and acceptance -- or even free speech -- for people who disagree with them.

The bottom line with any bigotry is that it's not going to just go away if you're nice. Bigots see stereotypes instead of real people, so how can we expect them to see the actions of real people? There is only one way that a targeted group has ever gotten any success in closing down bigotry -- and that is to demand that it stop. Being nice doesn't do it. Being innocent of offense doesn't do it. The only thing that works is to demand that the bigots cease practicing bigotry.

It's time to do this with extremist feminism.

Let's stop being nice to the bigots.¹⁵⁵

An Honest Feminist

Speaking of bigots, the following comments were posted on the Usenet by a feminist on May 7. They are so instructive that they are presented without further comment. (And yes, she's entirely serious.)

"So when I read a feminist assuring us how she really, really loves men, I know I've found another man-hater. If she loved men, she wouldn't be a feminist. 'Nuff said."¹⁵⁶

You Might be a Male Feminist If...

On Fri, 09 May 1997, in a Usenet thread called "Man Haters," a fellow named Bob wrote:

"I am male and view men who aren't bastards as exceptions. As a matter of fact I am a bastard, so I don't include myself in the exceptions."

You might be a male feminist if: you wholeheartedly embrace anti-male stereotypes and male self-hatred.¹⁵⁷

Susan McDougal's Delicate Ears

A few news items on all those privileges males have in society:

Lawyers claim that Paul Prioli owed \$144,700 alimony. So they had him arrested.

The scene for the arrest was sort of unusual. They got the man as he was leaving his father's funeral in Barnstable, Massachusetts.

Remember, no time is a bad time to hit men for money.

And remember how feminists are always telling us that women are more sensitive and nurturing than men? Let's take a look at Jenise Gordon, a science teacher in Milan, Tennessee.

Gordon recently put on a puppet show for her class.

Now it happens that in her class is a boy named Justin Galloway. Justin, 14, is a mentally and physically disabled student. His disabilities sometimes cause him to slur his words or to twitch. Well, the kindly Ms. Gordon got up in front of class and had her puppet imitate all of Justin's disabilities. To make sure everyone got the point, she called the puppet Justin Galloway. After the class, other students began calling Justin "Puppet Boy."

When his parents protested this treatment, they got an up-close demonstration of sensitive, nurturing behavior. Ms. Gordon is the coach of the girls' basketball team. Justin began getting threats from other students, including members of the girls' team. One called him up and told him to "watch his back."

Maybe that ought to be a new theme for all of these commercials that make girls/womens sports look like a mystical, religious experience. "If you let me play, I will threaten disabled students."

Per's MANifesto is proud to bring you news items like this, which just *somehow* manage to get missed by the national news media. If a male teacher had used a puppet to comment on a girl's body, you can be you would have seen it on the front pages. But Ms. Gordon's sadistic little puppet show gets buried in the back pages.

But now on to a story that got national attention because of its link to the Whitewater scandal. Susan McDougal's lawyers have been protesting her treatment while being held in prison on contempt charges. One of their complaints is that she has heard male prisoners being gang-raped on the floors above.

"It is doubtful that any convicted criminal in the U.S. is treated more harshly than Susan McDougal is and has been treated," her lawyers said.

We don't know about that. We kind of think that the men being *gang raped* might be getting treated more harshly.¹⁵⁸

This Will Need More Research

Canadian researchers say that women might suffer from certain kinds of psychological problems like depression and eating disorders because they manufacture much less of an important mood-regulating brain chemical called serotonin.

That's interesting. After all these years of feminists blaming men for causing women's eating disorders, it looks like the culprit might not be men after all.

We know how much this will disappoint many feminists who want to blame women's eating disorders on men. Gloria Steinem, in "Revolution from Within," claimed that "about 150,000 females die of anorexia each year" in the United States alone. (Turns out that Steinem was wildly wrong -- there are about 150,000 anorexia *cases,* not deaths, each year. Deaths are very rare and usually due to suicide.)

We know how disappointing it must be to some feminists to learn that eating disorders might not be the fault of men "objectifying" women's bodies. And that the cause might

actually lie in the women themselves. We know how much this upsets the feminist order of the universe. So we're willing to help them salvage their "it's always a man's fault" argument.

Hmm: How about this. "Women are socialized to manufacture less serotonin. (There are no innate differences between men and women, so socialization explains everything.) Feminist research shows that parental encouragement reinforces boys when they manufacture serotonin. Obviously we're going to need to establish a massive new bureaucracy to teach girls the self esteem needed to raise their serotonin levels."

There you go feminists -- that's a start on your research, free of charge. Just remember to put Per's MANifesto in your bibliography when you publish your "research."¹⁵⁹

Free Press? Sure, Help Yourself

For the sixth time since November, thousands of copies of The Daily Californian newspaper have been stolen from the rack on the University of California at Berkeley campus.

Somebody doesn't want readers to see The Daily Californian. And they don't want the paper to be able to speak freely.

Why? The editors believe it's because the paper supports Proposition 209, which would do away with the racial and sexual discrimination known as affirmative action. The pro-discrimination forces are apparently upset that anyone has the freedom to disagree.

The most recent efforts to censor the paper via theft occurred after it ran an editorial calling anti-209 forces hypocritical and immature.

Obviously with the paper thefts, the label of immature is right on target. But we're not sure it's accurate to call these people hypocritical. If they never supported free speech and equal rights, they're not being hypocritical.¹⁶⁰

The Former American Civil Liberties Union

One of the saddest and most shocking downfalls in the area of civil liberties is the gradual slide of the group known as the American Civil Liberties Union. The group once stood for the principle that everyone

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

had the same rights, and that those rights could not be taken away from a group or individual simply because society disapproved of them.

However, the ACLU went through a phase in which it decided to recruit feminists and other far-left activists. The result is that in many ACLU chapters, the belief is that some rights are equaler than others. Where the old ACLU believed that everyone had the same rights, many new ACLU chapters believe that your rights depend on the group you belong to. If you're a feminist, you have a right to be free of hearing views that might cause you distress. Hence, other people do not have an equal right to express their views if you don't like them.

The new ACLU has come out in favor of racial and sexual discrimination known as affirmative action. It now believes that your right to be protected from discrimination depends on what group you belong to. You have to keep these facts in mind when the ACLU asks for your help. Why should you support a group that advocates discrimination and an erosion of rights?

Equally sad is the new ACLU's support for the procedure known as "partial birth abortion."

In this procedure, a fetus -- often one that could live outside the womb -- is pulled from the womb feet first, with only the head still inside the birth canal. Then the doctor pierces the skull with scissors, drains the skull, and collapses it. Doing the same thing with the skull outside the birth canal might be considered murder.

The American Medical Association, at its recent convention in Chicago, said there is absolutely no time in which a partial birth abortion is necessary, and the group supported the proposed ban on the procedure. Initially, the AMA had been uncommitted on the ban. But then lawmakers changed the bill to give more assurances that doctors wouldn't be prosecuted for doing the procedure. With those changes made, the AMA came out in support of the ban.

Unfortunately, the ACLU has aligned itself with those who want to keep this grotesque procedure as a "choice." The so-called "Reproductive Freedom Project" of the ACLU is trying to get members to support partial birth abortions. Per's MANifesto

has obtained a copy of the mailing that the Reproductive Freedom Project sent out. It includes a postcard (with the Statue of Liberty) for people to send to politicians. (It bears the logo "liberty = choice.") It also includes a "model letter" for people to fire off to the right targets, and several other items that try to defend partial birth abortions.

Also included is a reprint of a New York Times op-ed piece by a woman who says she needed to do a partial birth abortion on a badly deformed fetus. Such emotionally wrenching stories are used as a cover for the fact that many partial birth abortions are done not on deformed fetuses but as a matter of convenience for women who waited too long.

Trying to defuse the idea that the procedure is "too gruesome and barbaric to defend," the RFP blithely states that "Many medical procedures -- open heart surgery or amputation, for example -- may seem gruesome to lay people." What the RFP doesn't note is that such procedures are done to heal, preserve and extend life, not terminate it. When a group starts playing so fast and loose with our emotions and the facts, you have to wonder how honest they're being with you.

The RFP also coyly says that "advocates of choice have found themselves enmeshed in controversy over how they presented facts and arguments about the ... procedure to legislators and the public." Well, it looks like the ACLU is exercising its right to speak in euphemisms. Actually, the controversy is that a major supporter of partial birth abortions admitted that he "lied through my teeth" when claiming the procedure is rarely done.

The RFP says that "whatever some individuals may have said, the movement has been truthful about this procedure." Clever. Once you admit to lying, you are no longer part of the "movement," even if you are a major player in it. So the "movement" can arbitrarily exclude any "individual" and pick and chose who they want to call the "movement."

Most Americans support the ban on partial birth abortions. No matter how people feel about abortion, most agree that sucking the brains out of a nearly developed child and

collapsing his or her skull is not a defensible "choice." Convenience is not reason enough to defend this procedure. It is another sad sign of the fall of the once-worthy ACLU that it could support this horrible procedure.¹⁶¹

The Senator's Level Playing Field

We all know how liberal Democrats demand a "level playing field" to assure fairness and equality in our society.

The latest to benefit from such a leveling is Massachusetts

Democratic Senator John "Kerry, Not Kennedy, Dammit" Kerry, and his wealthy wife.

Kerry is married to Teresa Heinz, heiress to the vast Heinz fortune. When you're worth about \$800 million, then obviously laws are for the little people -- including parking laws. Heinz has been caught parking in front of a fire hydrant by the luxurious Boston home she shares with Senator Kerry. Recently a newspaper caught her car -- with its license plate "HZ57" for "Heinz 57" -- parked that way.

So what did Kerry and Heinz do? Order sensitivity training? Wring their hands in guilt? Do community service? No, those are the programs that liberal Democrats demand for the lesser folk.

Instead, Kerry and Heinz had the fire hydrant removed.

They had it moved around the corner, so they won't be bothered with such details anymore.

"I've lived on Beacon Hill for 47 years and never have I known somebody to get a hydrant moved at their will," Peter Thomson, president of the Beacon Hill Civic Association, told the Associated Press. "You know why they did it: Because they jump through hoops when a high-power politician calls up for it."

What -- a liberal Democrat exercising aristocratic privilege? How can that possibly be? We know liberals are dedicated to a level playing field.

In fact, if you look at the spot where the fire hydrant once was, it looks pretty darn level, all right.¹⁶²

WELCOME READERS, to the newsletter that brings you the information you can use to debunk feminist propaganda and stereotypes. In this issue we take pride in giving you the goods on two treasured feminist beliefs: the legends of "amazons," and feminist finger-pointing over the breast-implant controversy. Plus good news on the justice system occasionally coming to its senses before it chews up innocent lives at the behest of extreme feminism, and more. So we'll title this issue "Amazon, Schmamazon." Enjoy! And if you know other people interested in the issues of man-bashing and anti-male stereotypes, pass this issue on them. Spread the word.*

Amazon, Schmamazon

The legend of the Amazons is cherished by feminism -- from the depiction of the comic-book Amazon "Wonder Woman" on the cover of the first Ms. Magazine to the TV character Xena. If you're on the Internet for any length of time, you're bound to run into some feminist with a net name of "Amazon" or "Xena" or some such.

But were Amazons more than a figment of the imagination? And why do they hold such a fascination for feminists?

Some feminists claim they are only interested in the concept of "strong women," though it's hard to miss the anti-male sentiments running through the mythology. Amazons, so the old story goes, lived separately from men, using men simply as sperm donors and often killing them after conception.

If feminists were merely interested in "strong women," one wonders why the imaginary Amazons appeal to them far more than real-life women who were both strong and allied with men. There are hardy pioneer women, women of Celtic or Germanic tribes who followed their men into war, and other such historically examples. But none of them have the same appeal as the group that supposedly cast out all men and killed their male infants. But, of course, feminists are

* NOTE: There's been a small change in the MANifesto web page address that hopefully will make the page load faster. It now is <http://idt.net/~per2/manifest.htm> (The only difference is that the old URL had "shell." after the http://) Both the old and the new URL still call the page up, but be sure to bookmark the new one!

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

merely interested in Amazons as "strong women."

It's interesting that so many feminists should idolize a group depicted as practicing rigid sexual segregation. Many feminists look on The Citadel and the Virginia Military Institute as evil because they excluded women. Then they idolize a group that killed male infants.

Go figure.

We can only imagine the outrage feminists would express if a good many men today expressed so much admiration for an ancient group of men who were believed to have murdered every single female born into their society. Such a society would be ranked with Nazism as the embodiment of evil. But when feminists do it, well, that's different somehow.

We've seen feminists work themselves into a rage over ancient tales of families that supposedly abandoned infant girls to die, because they wanted only boys who could do heavy manual labor. We've wondered how many of these feminist, amid their outrage, had some picture or statue of an Amazon in their offices, or key chains with Wonder Woman, or a videotape of Xena.

But, as we asked before, were Amazons real?

Our concepts of the Amazons trace back to the ancient Greeks. In the 5th century B.C., the historian Herodotus wrote tales of Greeks soldiers who battled fierce warrior women around the Black Sea, in what is now southern Russia. The Greeks supposedly defeated the Amazons at the battle of Thermopylae and brought back some captives. But Herodotus admitted that he had never seen an Amazon and based his entire account on hearsay.

How reliable was that hearsay? Well, it's about as credible as many Women's Studies courses -- which is to say, not very credible at all. The Amazon legend has been larded up with all sorts of quaint notions, including the idea that these women were so bad that they cut off or burned off their right breasts to improve their aim with the bow and arrow. That sounds like a tall tale that would certainly amaze the yokels. But picture women cutting off an entire breast in an era before sterile surgery, before people even understood the concept of germs. Not many

of *this* tribe would survive. Perhaps the idea of cutting off the breasts appeals to those who are unhappy with their gender. At any rate, historians now believe that this fanciful legend might be traced to a mistaken belief that the Greek name "Amazon" meant "without one breast." They now think it more likely meant "those who are not breast fed."*

Which brings us to modern research into the Amazon legend.

Archaeologists digging in a remote area of Russia near the Kazakhstan border say they have evidence of warrior women who lived about the same time as the supposed Amazons. They speculate that these warrior women -- or contemporary women similar to them -- might have given rise to the myth of the Amazons. But there's a catch: they weren't a feminist, utopian society that barred men and exercised their "right to choose" against helpless male infants. They were women living in tribes in which many of the men were warriors -- and most of the women were not.

From the Washington Post article cited above: "The latest evidence came from archaeologist Jeannine Davis-Kimball and Russian colleagues, who spent five years excavating more than 150 burial mounds of 5th century B.C. nomads near Pokrovka, Russia. They found that 14 percent of the graves were those of women buried with bronze daggers, arrowheads, swords, whetstones for sharpening, and/or other suggestive artifacts and signs of a warrior status. 'These finds suggest that Greek tales of Amazon warriors may have had some basis in fact,' Davis-Kimball writes in the January/February issue of *Archaeology* magazine, where 50 of the burial sites are described. Director of the Center for the Study of Eurasian Nomads in Berkeley, Calif., Davis-Kimball outlines the findings in more detail in an upcoming issue of the *Journal of Indo-European Studies*. Though the Pokrovka nomads were not the Amazons of myth, she concludes, they could have inspired the legends."

Davis-Kimball also notes: "In addition to the significant minority that held weapons,

* Kathy Sawyer, "Amazons: The Ms. Behind the Myth?" *The Washington Post*, May 12 1997; Page A03

dozens of other female graves contained domestic items such as spindlewhorls (for weaving), fragments of broken mirrors, and stone and glass beads. A handful included clay or stone altars, bone spoons and sea-shells, apparently denoting priestesses."

So how much did such women resemble the Amazons whose legend they might have inspired? "Neither man-killing Amazons nor conquerors in the mold of the more recent Attila the Hun or Genghis Khan, these women were probably shepherders who carried weapons to defend themselves against thieving or rapacious marauders, she said. When threatened, they 'took to their saddles, bows and arrows ready, to defend their animals, pastures and clan.'"

So much for the "romantic" notion of an anti-male warrior class. These women were working alongside men, not against them. They could accomplish much -- not by taking an anti-male path, but by joining with men. Those women who fought would probably have done so to *protect* their society and their families, rather than tearing them apart. And it appears they would have been willing to bear burdens, face danger and even sacrifice their lives to protect others. What a difference compared to those feminists who demand instant "equality" without equal sacrifice, who demand that society protect their rights and freedoms, even their sensitive natures, while they protect and respect the rights of no one.

We certainly hope this research continues. It's enough to make some feminists turn against the idea of Amazons.¹⁶³

Breast Implants – Who's Responsible?

Ever since a number of women began complaining of mysterious symptoms they blamed on their silicone gel breast implants, the search has been on for someone to blame -- someone who would have to pay dearly.

They blamed the manufacturers of implants, of course. And along the way, they accused the manufacturers of playing games with women's health. Of course, most of the executives in charge of these corporations happened to be male. So the implant issue became a lightning rod for all sorts of unresolved resentments against men. Feminists were not far behind.

Soon we were awash in male-bashing. It was the fault of greed manufacturers who were waging war on women's bodies. It was the fault of shallow men who forced women into "the beauty trap." It was the fault of men in the entertainment industry who glorified physical beauty.

Lawyers have garnered staggering awards and managed to bankrupt one manufacturer of the implants -- in turn making it more difficult to get silicone for the many other surgical devices needed by other patients. All this despite an astounding lack of evidence that silicone implants caused these mysterious problems.

The breast implant controversy certainly gave the anti-male forces a lot of ammunition to throw at men.

So it is noted with irony that the people who might really be responsible for these mysterious medical maladies are -- the women who get breast implants.

While complaining about mysterious damage to their immune systems, these women have been curiously immune to scrutiny themselves.

But now a new study has shown that women who get implants also are more likely to engage in a number of risky activities that increase the danger of something going wrong. Such women tend to drink more, have more sex partners, get pregnant at younger ages and have abortions. They are more likely to use the pill. And -- as you might expect from people interested in their appearance -- they are more likely to dye their hair. Hair dye, for example, could increase the risk of connective tissue diseases.

The study, done by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle, appeared in the May 28 issue of *The Journal of the American Medical Association*. Linda S. Cook of the Hutchinson Center said the study was undertaken to show the importance of assessing other risk factors before giving women implants.

According to a May 28 Associated Press story by reporter Mike Robinson: "Cook found women with enlargements were nearly three times more likely to drink seven or more alcoholic beverages a week, more than 1.5 times as likely to be pregnant before age 20 and twice as likely to have had an abor-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

tion. She found they were more than twice as likely to have used oral contraceptives, about 4.5 times more likely to dye their hair, nearly nine times as likely to have had at least 14 sexual partners."

Although the study appeared in one of the most respected medical journals in the world, breast implant "activists" have moved to quash it. The tack they are taking is that the study will be used to "slander" women who have implants.

Sure. And noting a connection between alcohol and liver cirrhosis might slander people who drink a lot. But there's the facts.

Here's what one of these "activists" said: "We believe it would be an insult not only to these women but to the authors of the JAMA study as well if self-serving parties were to use the JAMA study as a means for character assassination," said Sybil Goldrich, head of Los Angeles-based Command Trust Network, which represents women suing breast implant manufacturers.

This is a truly bizarre turnaround. Here we have an activist who is supposedly concerned about the health of women. And then when warning flags go up all over the place about the risky behavior of these women, she wants it swept under the rug. Sometimes we wonder why the people who talk the loudest about the health, rights, equality, and safety of women seem to abandon those goals when the "enemy" is no longer some convenient bogeyman -- emphasis on the *man.*

One of the sideshows of the implant controversy has been women complaining about "the beauty trap" -- the male-dominated conspiracy that somehow forces them to do things like lose weight, die their hair, or get implants. But we know of no roving goon squad that throws women down onto the floor and forces implants on them.

However, we're willing to listen to what feminists say about implants. In fact, one is writing about them in the latest issue of Playboy -- the one that says "A Feminist Goes for Big Gazongas" on the cover. (We think it's the June issue. Don't ask us -- we read about this in the June 24th Washington Post, page B7. And yes, you can stop snickering now.)

In the article "Stacked Like Me," Jan Breslauer tells of her decision to have im-

plants. What makes this whole episode all the more delightful is that Ms. Breslauer is a former teacher of feminist theory at Yale's divinity school, no less.

"Sure, I know the party line on breast augmentation -- that women who have the surgery are the oppressed victims of a patriarchal culture," she writes. But that "moldy notion" is now obsolete. "Today, it stands more as a sign that women have gained power, that they've become subjects rather than objects of history. Some men pride themselves on being self-made. Now women are free to become self-made. The boob job has become the latest expression of the American love of self-creation."

And her article is certainly an expression of the American love of tacking noble motives onto the things we do.

We commend Ms. Breslauer for dispensing with the feminist propaganda. Eighty percent of implants are for so-called cosmetic reasons -- meaning they were not needed medically, after mastectomy, for instance. Some women have implants to please a certain man, some have them to improve their chances in the dating game. Some have them for reasons that Breslauer hints at -- "empowerment" and "confidence." In other words, they know darn well they can use sex (and sexual manipulation) in their schemes to get ahead. That has been a tactic of women throughout the ages. It's time for them to stop claiming to be victims and start taking responsibility.¹⁶⁴

Deliver us from Clitoris

Well, we didn't set out to write a concept issue about body parts, but they've been in the news lately. So let's take a look at dispatches from the wild and wacky world of gender warfare in the feminist age.

You may remember Kevin Gillson from the April issue of Per's MANifesto. Gillson is an 18-year-old Wisconsin resident who was arrested after trying to marry his pregnant girlfriend. When he found out she was pregnant, he did the responsible thing -- trying to get a job, get married, and support his family.

However, his girlfriend was 15 at the time. This makes this cleancut, responsible young man into a "sexual predator," at least in the

nearsighted eyes of the law in Port Washington, Wisconsin.

His girlfriend pleaded with prosecutors that the sex was consensual. The jurors themselves said they hated to convict him but felt that the statutory-rape law gave them no choice. Gillson could have faced up to 40 years in prison.

But the good news, we're glad to relate, is that he was sentenced to two year's probation. (The absurdity of it is that he has to register with local police as a "sex offender," and that means he's barred from things such as coaching youth baseball. Also, he must provide authorities with a DNA sample. We wonder what the outrage of feminists would be if this were a woman -- that her privacy is invaded and her body violated, etc., etc.)

Besides the decision for probation, here is also more good news to this cause. Namely, the prosecutor who brought these charges was booed outside the courthouse, and apparently a lot of people are upset with her absurd prosecution of the case.

District Attorney Sandy Williams was up for re-election when she decided to press this case. If she thought she could boost her re-election chances by nailing a "sexual predator," it backfired.

We've seen a lot of people try to ride anti-male sentiment into office. We've seen activists in social-service agencies and prosecutors offices decide to go after whatever "epidemic" is being blamed on men this week.

If that was Williams' intent, then we hope the voters register their displeasure at election time -- and in doing so, maybe they can make their hometown a bit less of a national laughingstock.

Meanwhile, at least seven jurors signed a letter asking Gov. Tommy Thompson to pardon Gillson. We'll be interested in seeing what the governor does. Governors have pardoned women who killed men in cold blood and claimed the "battered women" defense. So if women can get pardons when they murder men, we'll see if a man can get a pardon when he loves a woman.

And in Arlington, Virginia, we have another case of sexual harassment laws trying to make criminals out of little boys. In this case, a 9-year-old boy was accused of pressing his crotch against a girl who was ahead

of him in a lunch line at Glebe Elementary School. His lawyer -- yes, the boy had to get a lawyer -- said the boy was reaching for an apple and brushed against the girl.

Making sure that common sense didn't have a snowball's chance, school officials then called police to investigate. So police had to file a report. Then, according to the Associated Press, "a juvenile court office decided the case could not legally be handled informally." So the 9-year-old boy was scheduled to go on trial July 8 on a charge of "aggravated sexual battery."

That meant he could have been sent to a youth home until he was 21. (Which means he would have served far more time than Tracy Ribitch, a 19-year-old Macomb County, Michigan, woman who pleaded guilty to killing her newborn child and was sentenced to lecturing teenagers about safe sex. See the March 1997 issue of MANifesto.)

The Associated Press is not identifying the mutton-head in the juvenile court office who made this decision. When a public official is responsible for a decision this misguided, we ought to be told. It's not a minor detail. And the official who made the decision is left on the job.

Fortunately, this is one of those cases where sanity prevailed. Prosecutors decided to drop the charges.

We're reminded of feminists' claims that girls are somehow "disadvantaged" in school. The boy in this case is diagnosed as having attention deficit disorder -- which is much higher among boys -- and he was in a special education class. In addition to this problem he was already coping with, he found himself facing felony charges and had to hire a lawyer. Also, he has had to transfer to a different school, which probably won't help his education any. This, apparently, is all part of all those advantages that boys enjoy over girls.

When feminists decide they are going to "level the playing field," that often translates into leveling whatever unfortunate males wander into their gun sights.

After the charges were dropped, the boy's lawyer told him: "Congratulations. You are not a criminal."

Sure. But he's born male, and that seems to make him a criminal in the eyes of many feminists who created this sort of hysteria.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

And next up, we'd like to tell you about the woman who needs protection from the word "clitoris."

It involves a "sexual harassment" complaint brought against Jerold Mackenzie, a former executive with the Miller Brewing company. Former, because he was fired in 1993 for telling a woman about an episode of the "Seinfeld" show that mentioned the word "clitoris." (The story is in the news now because he is suing the company.)

Company officials claim that Mr. Mackenzie was fired because this incident was "the last straw" in a series of harassment complaints. But if the word "clitoris" is the straw that breaks the camel's back, that's one awfully weak camel.

Mackenzie said he brought up the episode because Miller is a sponsor of the "Seinfeld" show. In discussing it, he never actually said the word himself, but pointed it out in a dictionary. He said he was discussing the show because he didn't know how the word got through the censors.

(We know how the word got by the censors. If a TV show had been censored for saying it, there would have been a massive outcry over censorship. Newspapers, TV shows, the ACLU and other self-appointed guardians of free speech would have mounted a huge campaign to protect the right to say that word -- and to ridicule the people who tried to censor it. But now, the crack-down on free speech is coming from the politically correct side of the debate. So Mr. Mackenzie is fired, and the usual guardians of free speech have merely clicked their remotes so they don't have to address the issue. The people who would not have stood for it if a TV show had been censored for using the word don't seem to be very upset that a private citizen can be fired for pointing to it in a dictionary. Apparently, TV shows have more rights than private citizens.)

Company officials say that Mackenzie had been lectured about inappropriate behavior after his secretary accused him of sexual harassment in 1989. Then he was fired four years later over the "clitoris" incident. It happened when a woman, Patricia Best, claimed that she was "uncomfortable" with the discussion. So she told a superior, and Mackenzie was fired within a week.

We don't know how valid the other claims of sexual harassment are in this case. But it's interesting that a man could be fired because a woman claimed she was "uncomfortable." We've re-read the First Amendment and didn't find any exemption for female discomfort.

But we suspect that the company was afraid of getting trashed if it didn't fire Mackenzie. We suspect that this Patricia Best could have gone to the news media and gotten all the publicity and support she wanted. It was simply easier to fire Mackenzie than face the public-relations disaster that feminist would have been able to foment.

So that means that your rights to free speech and your right to a job are considerably less if a woman is "uncomfortable."

For us, one of the most notable aspects of this case is that a woman had to be protected from speech that made her "uncomfortable." This is the "I Am Woman, Hear Me Roar" era. Feminists want women to be Marines and combat fighter pilots. They cultivate an image of "strong women" and accuse society of "oppressing" women if society has seemed too protective. They accuse society of "socializing" women to be timid and seek protection. And then feminist policy dictates that a woman has to be protected from the word "clitoris."

Another irony is that Ms. Best probably could have called every man in that office a "prick" and never faced similar discipline.

Why? Well, harassment laws draw on the idea of whether a "reasonable woman" would feel harassed in a given situation. A "reasonable woman" can object to actions that a "reasonable man" would be expected to shrug off. "Reasonable men" are expected to handle such abuse, and they would be laughed at if they complained. Not so "reasonable women."

But if men are expected to handle such abuse with aplomb, doesn't that reveal an underlying belief that men are stronger, more resilient? If women need protection from words, doesn't that reveal an underlying belief that women are more fragile? We raise these questions because it's feminism itself that keeps saying that women need protection from words.¹⁶⁵

The Right to Bash Men

Recently a feminist on a Usenet group posted another one of those messages about how feminism is about equality and inclusivity, about valuing men and women equality, about moral and ethical behavior that is for the good of everyone, and so on.

Nice words.

Too bad they rarely match the actions.

For example, here's a story out of West Palm Beach, Florida, where two men who are teachers have been subjected to the hostile working environments created by man-bashers. Oh, we know that feminists claim they oppose hostile working environments. But we have seen first-hand just how hostile they can be -- and how they can get away with it when the system protects only them and punishes only other people.

Hopefully the tide might be turning. An English teacher, Nick Nowak, recently was awarded \$102,688 by a Palm Beach County jury after suing over the hostile working environment at Wellington High School. He taught there for twelve years.

Unfortunately, the jury did not find that Nowak had been subjected to a hostile working environment. But they did find that school administrators retaliated against him for complaining about it.

Mr. Nowak tried talking to officials to get the man-bashing to stop. That seems reasonable. Doesn't feminism object to gender bashing and hostile working environments? Doesn't feminism say people should be protected from them?

Well, not in Palm Beach County, apparently. After Nowak asked that the man-bashing stop, he was subject to repeated retaliation. Apparently these people think that they not only have the right to bash men, they also have the right to silence those who object to their special privilege.

"I asked the school board to investigate this three years ago and nobody helped me," Nowak said in a June 6 Associated Press story. He resigned last year.

Another teacher, Tim Adamchik also filed suit. He also says he was harassed and forced out of his job at Wellington.

Per's MANifesto is proud to bring you news items like these -- when the national news media keeps burying them in the back pages. If there was a school where two

women had been forced out because of such a hostile working environment, you can bet it would be receiving a lot more attention.

William Riker, a lawyer for Nowak, put it this way: "There is a glass ceiling over there, but now women are in power."

And if you've been on the Usenet for any length of time, you know there are feminists who are cheering in delight at the thought of this.

Where are the ones who are objecting to it? Oh, well, they probably had more important things to do than to object to sexism, gender hatred, sexual discrimination and hostile working environments.¹⁶⁶

Be Prepared ... for Feminist "Equality"

A California state appeals court recently ruled that the Boy Scouts do not have to admit a girl.

(The lawsuit was brought by -- who else -- Gloria Allred, the feminist lawyer who believes in "recovered memories" but can't seem to recover a memory that someone else was killed that night with Nicole Simpson. But anyway ...)

"The Boy Scouts of America stands alone among scouting organizations in English-speaking countries in attempting to defend gender apartheid and gender segregation," Allred said.

Sorry, Gloria, the Boy Scouts are not alone on "gender apartheid and gender segregation." Maybe you forgot about the 80-some women-only colleges in the United States. Colleges that receive state support in some form or another. If you forgot about those women-only institutions -- or women's sports teams, Women's Studies departments, mentoring programs for women only, not to mention the Brownies and the Campfire Girls, etc., we're glad to remind you. Surely your commitment to ending "gender apartheid" will cause you to sue some of those programs.

Currently, boys have higher rates of learning disorders, higher rates of dropouts, higher rates of alcohol and drug abuse, and higher rates of suicide. The number of boys growing up without fathers has skyrocketed, in large part due to the feminist divorce revolution, feminism's antipathy toward men, and feminism's dogged preservation of a woman's traditional gender role of getting

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

sole custody. And studies show that boys growing up without fathers are vulnerable to a host of ills, including higher involvement in drugs and criminal activity. Boys without the structure and sense of direction provided by a two-parent family often get mixed up in the structure of street gangs.

Yet when boys actually get a chance to form positive relationships with other boys and male leaders in the Boy Scouts, there's the feminist, demanding "equality." This case underscores once again that men deserve an equal voice in determining was sexual "equality" means.

As for the June 4 ruling, by the 3rd District Court of Appeal, saying that the Boy Scouts did not have to admit the girl, it was based on the idea that the Boy Scouts are not a business.

Darn. We hoped the ruling was based on a return to reality.¹⁶⁷

Battered Woman's Defense: License to Kill

As we mentioned before, there are feminists who want women to get away with murder by simply claiming the "battered woman" defense. It just happened again in Florida.

Maria Garcilazo of Miami confessed to killing her husband, Carlos. So, did she kill him while defending herself from some supposed "attack"?

Nope. She shot him in the head in their bedroom and then tried to cover up the evidence. As the Associated Press reported: "She tied the body to the family truck and dragged it a few blocks away from their house. She removed his wedding ring and other jewelry and filed a missing persons report."

When caught, she began telling tales of being "raped" every day and beaten. Of course Carlos is not here to give his version of the events.

The "battered woman's defense" was instrumental in getting Garcia acquitted. The "battered woman's defense" has become a license to kill.

So why would she kill him if she wasn't afraid for her life?

It was revealed during the trial that she was afraid that she was about to be dumped by her husband for another woman.

Hmm. Then all of a sudden he becomes a rapist-abuser and has to be shot. What a coincidence.¹⁶⁸

Children belong with their Mother?

Fathers face enormous bias from society and the courts when they seek custody and visitation. The attitude of many people, including many social workers and judges, is that the children not only belong with the mother, they belong to the mother.

That's why we see absurd decisions like the one involving Sayeh and Arash Rivazfar, two kids living with their father in the town of Greece, New York. Their mother lives in Florida. She got a judge to order a transfer in custody and have the kids shipped to Florida.

But the father, Ahmad Rivazfar, says the kids are terrified of their mother and of returning to her home in Florida.

The kids have good reason. One of them was raped there. And their sister was murdered by a man their mother knew.

With all the emphasis on what's good for the children, it would seem like it's a no-brainer not to send these kids back to a place where they don't feel safe -- a place of so much horror and trauma for them.

But a Florida court ordered a custody transfer.

However, the case is on appeal in the New York Court of Appeals over which state has jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, the national news media have a field day playing up the case of the so-called "Harvard Mom" who feared she would lose custody because she was a single mother going to college. This case got reams of publicity. But the Rivazfar custody case has been mostly ignored. Why is that, if we're so interested in the welfare of children? Is it because the Rivazfar case doesn't look so good for those who believe that children belong with their mothers?¹⁶⁹

The Former ACLU, Part Deux

Last issue, we told you about the American Civil Liberty Union's unfortunate policy of supporting the "right" to partial birth abortion. Their support for this questionable procedure is disturbing enough. But the material they publish in support of partial-birth abortion displays a cavalier attitude

toward the lies that have been put forth to defend the procedure.

Our disenchantment with this once-noble organization is only intensifying. The ACLU has failed to support the rights of people whose lives are being destroyed by false accusations of abuse -- in particular those arising from the modern witch hunts over "satanic cults" in daycare centers, false memories arising from the so-called "recovered memory therapy," and the new forms that these hysterias take once the old forms are disproven.

It used to be that entire communities could be thrown into hysteria -- neighbor spying on neighbor, relatives informing on relatives -- by rumors of "satanic cults" operating in daycare centers. The most notorious case happened, of course, at McMartin Preschool in California. There, the hysteria was touched off by a woman named Judy Johnson, later diagnosed as a paranoid schizophrenic. Her ravings -- now quite absurd in retrospect -- might have been dismissed for the delusions they were. But her bizarre accusations were championed by sets of social workers whose attitude was essentially that anyone who is accused is guilty and any child who denies being abused is in "denial." These social workers interrogated the young, suggestible children in obviously flawed ways -- asking leading questions, refusing to believe them when they said they hadn't been touched, badgering and yelling at them until they gave the "right" answer.

Jurors who saw tapes of these social workers in action realized that the children were being led and coerced.

And yet the fundamentally flawed techniques used to get such "accusations" from children continue to be used, and innocent people have gone to prison because of them. Social workers discovered that getting accusations of "satanic cults" from little children often hurt their cases. So they changed their techniques and started looking for "sex rings." That sounds a bit more believable than satanic cults, even though the questioning process has all the same flawed, leading tactics and abuses.

If such a biased, flawed system was being used to send people to jail on suspicions of being subversives or anarchists, we might expect the ACLU to get involved. This is,

after all, a new form of McCarthyism, where false accusations are motivated by personal revenge, people are considered guilty by association, and many good people are too frightened to speak up for fear of being labeled one of the bad guys. The ACLU -- let's call them the *former* American Civil Liberties Union -- has sat on the sidelines while this goes on.

Nat Hentoff, a vocal supporter of civil liberties, recently took the ACLU to task over their lack of support for innocent people accused of such questionable charges. In his syndicated column, he notes "the absence of the ACLU and its more than 300 chapters from an epidemic of civil liberties disasters that have taken place in a number of states, and still do. With no physical evidence and the sole testimony of very young children who have been coached by therapists and police investigators, many workers in daycare centers have been charged with sexual abuse of those children. Some of the defendants have been imprisoned for long periods. Months ago, I asked Nadine Strossen, president of the ACLU, why it has not become involved in at least some of these many cases."

He received no answer.*

In particular, Hentoff notes the latest panic over "sex rings" in Wenatchee, Washington. In this case, "those defendants who were on welfare could not afford experienced lawyers and wound up in prison. Defendants who could pay for seasoned lawyers were acquitted. If the ACLU had been involved, defendants without money and without due process might never have gone to prison.

"It's too bad the ACLU doesn't have some competition -- nationally and locally. On some issues, the ACLU's thinking has stopped and there are only rehearsed responses -- or none at all."

Hentoff's criticism is on target, but a little background will help us understand why the ACLU so drastically abandoned its commitments to rights. Namely, a great number of feminists were affirmatively advanced to high positions in the ACLU and have changed its focus. It used to be a group that said everyone had the same rights, no matter

* "Two Cheers for the ACLU," *The Washington Post*, Saturday, June 7, 1997; Page A23

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

how unpopular, poor, or disenfranchised they were. It has changed into a group where many chapters now believe that your rights depend on what group you belong to -- some groups have to have their rights protected more, and some rights are equaler than others.

Some people are going to say "There goes Per, blaming the feminists again." Yes, I am, because in this case they deserve the credit. The types of witch hunts at McMartin and the Little Rascals daycare centers, in Wenatchee, in Bakersfield, California, and elsewhere grew out of feminist activism in the area of sexual abuse. They worked to overturn protections for the accused, and to make it possible to convict people based solely on an accusation lacking any physical evidence. They convinced Congress and other public bodies that there was an "epidemic" of abuse going on, and that we had to adopt these flawed, misleading investigative techniques to extract accusations from children. They instituted "recovered memory therapy" and other pseudo-scientific quackery. All these developments arose out of the sphere of feminist activism on sexual issues.

And while feminist activists were working to change the justice system to make the witch hunts possible, major feminists were in front of the cameras spreading the hysteria. The hysteria involving McMartin Preschool and "satanic cults" in daycare centers has been fomented by such major feminists as Gloria Steinem and Ms. Magazine. Gloria Allred, the feminist attorney, supports "recovered memory therapy," even though it produces false accusations of child abuse.

These witch hunts grew in the fertile soil of feminism -- the "Believe the Children" movement, feminism's cries that there were "epidemics" of rape, Andrea Dworkin's claim that fathers rape their daughters as a form of socialization -- these and other feminist beliefs spiraled out of control into the witch hunt that destroys innocent lives. Feminism deserves credit and praise for launching a campaign to bring incest into the open and punish the abusers. But at some point, just as with Judy Johnson and McMartin Preschool, the accusations left the realm of reality. The people looking for incest began to rely on a pseudo-science called "recovered memory therapy." This is

the same process used by people who "recover memories" of being abducted by flying saucers or of living "past lives." Patients are bombarded with drugs, hypnosis, social isolation, sleep deprivation, and cult-like reinforcement until they "recover" whatever memories the therapist wants. Some therapists have an eye on the fat paychecks from insurance premiums. Others have an agenda. They haven't let the innocence of the accused get in their way.

The tide may be turning. George Franklin -- who was convicted of murder based on his daughter's "recovered memories" -- is now a free man. This is the case that kicked off the current hysteria over "recovered memories." But he was freed after the evidence became undeniable that the trial judge had erred in several points -- and that the accuser had lied numerous times.

Yet still the ACLU is not defending innocent people accused of running "sex rings" and "satanic cults." Why? Could it be because the modern ACLU has so many feminists and feminist sympathizers? After all, if the ACLU fought for the rights of these often-helpless people, it would be angering the major feminists who support "recovered memory therapy" and other witch hunts. Perhaps the ACLU isn't willing to embarrass these feminists. Moreover, perhaps many feminists within the ACLU really believe all the mumbo-jumbo about satanic cults and recovered memories.

Or maybe they are afraid that by defending innocent people against witch hunts, they will discredit the feminists who have for so long pushed the ideas behind these witch hunts. These feminists would be forced to admit they are wrong. But they don't. Apparently they would rather bury their mistakes -- and bury innocent people in prison.

It is sad that the ACLU would rather stand by and see innocent people destroyed rather than irritate some of their allies -- people who doubtlessly could make trouble for the ACLU.

And so the former ACLU goes about its course. It defends partial birth abortion, and ignores innocent people being crushed by runaway hysteria. The ACLU defends the "right" to jam scissors into the skull of a practically-born infant -- yet won't defend

the rights of people who have done nothing to deserve prison.¹⁷⁰

Dirty Tricks

If the ACLU is afraid to defend people who are falsely accused, there are feminists who certainly aren't afraid to make false accusations. Recently on the Usenet, the subject came up of false accusations made during divorce proceedings. It prompted this reply from a feminist:

On 16 Jun 1997 11:09:52 -0700, goddess@kira.peak.org (Marg Petersen) wrote:

"And filing true allegations of child abuse/molestation is a necessity for the safety of the children or would you prefer that child molesters/abusers get off and be able to continue. I didn't know that you were an advocate for child abuse/molestation now, Per. Pity about that."

This trick, while dirty, is not rare -- if someone objects to false accusations, you smear them as "pro abuse." It was just this sort of tactic that helped the McMartin case and other hysterias spiral out of control.

The "pity" here is that this feminist sees nothing wrong with false accusations. And, for the record, she has often painted herself as a fair, ethical and moral feminist.

For those who have been falsely accused during custody disputes, we highly recommend the books of Dean Tong, who went through that ordeal himself and has much valuable information to share. You can read about his books "ASHES to ASHES... Families to Dust" and "Don't Blame ME, Daddy" on his web¹⁷¹ site.¹⁷² ...¹⁷³

Speaking of Dirty Tricks

June 17th marked The 25th anniversary of the break-in at Democratic headquarters at the Watergate. It's fitting that we remember the above-the-law mentality that led to the abuses of Richard Nixon and his cohorts.

Sam Dash, who was the chief lawyer for the Senate committee on Watergate, said Nixon "was the only president who took seriously the concept 'imperial presidency' ... actually thought that a president was above the law." Nixon and his aides "saw themselves as the guardians of America as they saw it, and therefore anybody who disagreed with that theory of America had to

be an enemy, had to be destroyed," Dash said. "That is so incompatible with our concept of American democracy and separation of powers. ... Unless we understand it and (understand it) well, it could happen again."

Those are wise words. And we should understand them, because it is happening again. Extremist feminists believe they are above the law -- that women should be able to get away with murder by making the flimsiest claims of "abuse." They have defended women who use cocaine or drink alcohol while pregnant -- on the grounds that it's "her body, her choice" -- never mind the horrible damage done to the children. Extremist feminism has treated human life as a "privacy" issue for women, so that when mothers throw their inconvenient newborns into trash cans, they see it as just another "choice." And they want such killers to be sentenced to nothing more than probation or therapy. They have lost sight of the value of any life except their own.

To paraphrase Mr. Dash, extreme feminists see themselves as the guardians of womanhood as they see it, and therefore anybody who disagrees with them has to be an enemy, has to be destroyed. If you disagree with these feminists, you are a back-lasher, a sexist, a misogynist, and so on -- and they will use smear tactics, rumors, false accusations and guilt-by-association to ruin you. They will not let ethics get in the way of destroying someone who disagrees with these "guardians." The previous item showed one feminist willing to toss around false claims of abuse -- to try to destroy the "enemy" or silence the opposition through fear of being labeled an abuser. Already feminists have succeeded in making countless people reluctant to speak up for fear of being labeled "misogynist" and so on.

But if we let an intolerant group succeed, we have not escaped a momentary unpleasantness. We have set ourselves up for more unpleasantness -- and more serious unpleasantness. If extreme feminists are allowed to shout people down and silence them with smear tactics, why should we expect them to gain a moral conscience once they are solidly in power? Why do we assume that a group that has no respect for any rights except their own will abruptly switch about and defend the rights of all?

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

It's unrealistic to expect that. And so as we recall the words of Mr. Dash, we remember how much they apply today.¹⁷⁴

JULY 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue of news that is both tragic and encouraging. Sometimes it involves clear victories for real people. Other times it involves, at most, a bit of hope that truth might win in the end. Throughout this issue run the themes of false accusations, anti-male propaganda, even the so-called "recovered memory therapy." So we'll call this issue PATENTLY FALSE. And we deliver this issue to you with a firm belief that the tide is turning against false accusations and man-bashing propaganda.

Did False Accusations Kill Michael Dorris?

Novelist Michael Dorris was perhaps best known for his groundbreaking work on fetal alcohol syndrome -- informing the world about the damages done to a child when mothers drink while pregnant.

Dorris learned of this tragic condition when he adopted Abel, a 3-year-old Sioux boy neglected by his alcoholic mother. (It was 1971 and Dorris was one of the first single men to be allowed to adopt a child. Jimmy Smits later played Dorris in a TV movie based on Abel's troubles.)

The mother's drinking had caused Abel to suffer permanent brain damage -- including severe learning and behavioral disabilities that Michael Dorris wrote about in "The Broken Cord." In time, he adopted two more Indian children, Sava and Madeline. But sadly, he realized that they also suffered from the affects of prenatal drinking.

Dorris struggled to raise these troubled children, and eventually married aspiring writer Louise Erdrich and had daughters of his own with her.

But on April 10, 1997, Dorris killed himself, taking a combination of sleeping pills and vodka, and then placing a plastic bag over his head, dying of asphyxiation. Shortly afterward, the newspapers began to report that he had been under investigation for child sexual abuse. Remarkably, his wife had no comment about the charges and did

not seem very upset by his death. She acknowledged that she was in the process of divorcing him.

Then his adopted daughter Madeline sued his estate, claiming sexual abuse since she was a child.

New York magazine had done a scathing story on Dorris that claimed there was evidence of "very, very serious physical and sexual abuse" of two of the daughters he had with Erdrich, and that Dorris fondled and physically abused his adopted son Sava. And then there's Erdrich's remarkable silence as these tales are being spread about her late husband.

For most people, it was enough. It seems to make sense -- a pervert is caught abusing his children and kills himself. Why would he kill himself if he's innocent?

Few people even wanted to show up for his memorial, which took place in a nearly deserted room.

Michael Dorris deserves better than that. He told the nation about the dangers of drinking during pregnancy and made inroads for single dads.

And there is disturbing evidence that the accusations against Dorris were false, tragically false.

The New York magazine article is riddled with errors big and small -- "a mountain of misinformation," as the Washington Post put it. There also were indications of a possible child custody dispute in the offing. And the therapist who reported suspicions of child abuse was also behind a major witch hunt over child abuse allegation in which all the charges were eventually dropped. Most telling of all, many of the charges result from so-called "recovered memories."

The accusations against Dorris began at a time when he was sinking lower into despair and drink because his wife was leaving him, a time when he was less and less able to defend himself. His wife then brought in therapist Sandra Hewitt of St. Paul to talk to the children. Afterward, she contacted Hennepin County authorities to say she suspected Dorris of abusing the children.

It's not the first set of accusations she's been involved in. Fourteen years earlier, in Jordan, Minnesota, she was involved in an investigation of two supposed "sex rings." The investigation led to dozens of parents

being accused of abusing a hundred children. Some of the children were removed from their homes.

But the case collapsed when the original accuser admitted that he lied about the "sex rings." And parents and other psychologists noticed a familiar pattern in these massive allegations. They said that therapists and investigators brainwashed and coerced the children into making accusations. It's a pattern familiar to false-accusation cases from the McMartin Preschool to Wenatchee, Washington and beyond.

In the Jordan, Minnesota case, the charges were dropped and children returned to their homes. This is one case where mistakes can be rectified.

But Michael Dorris is dead. We can't bring him back. But we

can ask, did he deserve this?

One thing interesting about the involvement of the therapist Hewitt with the Dorris-Erdrich family. Erdrich claims that, as a therapist, Hewitt "works to reconcile [abusers] with their family members. If she has an agenda, it's to restore relationships."

But after Hewitt got involved, Michael Dorris never saw the three girls again.

And after she got involved, investigators sough Dorris' two surviving adopted children, Sava and Madeline Dorris, who accused Dorris of physical, sexual and emotional abuse.

Bingo. It looked like investigators had him nailed.

Sure it does. If you only look on the surface.

But these were two children he had adopted -- children who still suffered the affects of a lesser form of fetal alcohol syndrome from their mothers drinking while pregnant. As the Washington Post notes, "It's not clear whether the investigators ever understood the degree of enmity between these children and their father -- or the children's historical instability and unreliability." Erdrich had examined her diary for the last four years, and confirmed a distressing pathology: "It turned out that as a family we hadn't had a single period longer than three consecutive days in all that time when one of our alcohol-impaired children was not in a crisis -- health, home, school -- that demanded our undivided attention." These included arrests,

suicide attempts, violent behavior, expulsion from schools and "inappropriate sexual contact." Amid all the chaos and frustration, Michael Dorris at times hit his children.

These children, deeply troubled, deeply resentful, deeply angry, lashed out at Michael Dorris, giving authorities what they were looking for -- accusations of child abuse.

But what motive could they have unless it was true?

Consider Sava Dorris, one of the accusers. He was once jailed on a charge of assaulting his girlfriend and wrote to his parents: "The strange fact of it all is, is that I enjoyed doing it. ... I have gone crazy."

He demanded money from his parents, who feared him. Michael Dorris pressed extortion charges, which resulted in two hung juries.

In his defense during these trials, Sava Dorris never brought up the accusations of sexual abuse against his father he later made. It's an odd omission.

Then, later, investigators show up and ask Sava Dorris about abuse accusations that were launched with Hewitt's investigation. Now Sava is suddenly confirming their suspicions. If Sava had resentments, they had given him a perfect forum for getting even.

And as for Madeline Dorris' accusations, there is an easier explanation: so-called "recovered memories." Madeline Dorris is suing Erdrich and the Dorris estate, which is reputed to be worth more than \$2 million. The basis for this suit: she claims Michael Dorris sexually abused her regularly, from the time she was five years old -- and that she absolutely forgot about it. But now she has remembered because she recovered the suppressed memories.

If you know anything about "recovered memory therapy," you know it is quackery that allowed many therapists to drain millions in insurance money to pay for therapy that's never been proven to be valid. Moreover, "recovered memory therapy" involves many of the techniques that allow people to recover memories of being abducted by spaceships, or of living past lives. In other words, the process helps create false memories. And false memories lead to false accusations.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Madeline Dorris says she recovered these memories six years ago but she didn't tell anyone until now because she was afraid of her father. Right. She didn't mention this while he was alive and had a chance to reply. She told no one of a life history of abuse until she decided so go after the money in the estate.

Michael Dorris' suicide is not as clearcut as it would seem at first glance. It's always easy and tempting to believe the accusations, to believe the simple explanations -- he killed himself because he was guilty. But there has been a lot of misinformation (the New York magazine article) and a lot of suspicious accusations. And there are unanswered questions -- including whether over-eager prosecutors and activist "therapists" are so bent on getting accusations that they aren't careful enough in how they get them. This investigation was, after all, launched by Sandra Hewitt, who was involved in a case that resulted in hundreds of accusations of abuse that all were eventually dropped.

And the investigation is notable for what it did not involve -- interviewing a witness who had close personal knowledge of the Dorris household. Sandi Campbell, the couple's secretary for six years, said she would have testified to a lack of tension between Dorris and his three birth daughters -- the daughters that Hewitt first focused on when she made her first report of suspected abuse. "Campbell says she would have been happy to tell this to the child abuse investigators. She would have said that she never saw Dorris drunk or violent. She would have described him as an involved, loving father. But she was never questioned. She cannot understand it. 'How can you do a complete investigation on a man and not talk to the person who was in his house every day?' she asks."

We can understand it. Many of these activists don't look for evidence of innocence - even when it's readily available. For example, there were disputes about where the family wanted to live, and the three daughters wanted to move with Michael Dorris to New Hampshire. There was even talk of a custody dispute over this. And Erdrich at one point moved out of the house for a year. Does any of this suggest the actions of girls who are being sexually abused or a wife who

suspected that her husband was abusing his daughters? Would a mother move out and stay away if she thought this was happening?

We've heard some feminists who say that false accusations are constructive and instructive. They help sensitize men to women's feelings.

We say that *nothing* justifies a false accusation -- and any feminist who thinks a false accusation is a positive thing is being astoundingly, even ghoulishly, selfish. If they can feel even marginally safer, they don't care how many innocent men are ruined. They can't see -- or don't want to see -- the human carnage of false accusations. But if we want to get sensitized to people's feelings, let's try to understand what Michael Dorris was going through at the end of his life. He adopted children who turned out to have heart-breaking troubles and behavioral problems. He struggled to make a life for them and his family, and found that his family was just another casualty in the breakup of families everywhere. He had struggled to be a good father and had made mistakes along the way. Now children who were unstable were turning on him, resenting him, making accusations. And his wife was leaving him.

It is a profoundly anti-male outlook to assume that men aren't emotionally devastated in situations like this -- to assume that suicide was merely a way of escaping a jail sentence, rather than an act of despair at losing the people closest to him.

Dorris once wrote: "Once we love, we are permanently in that love's thrall, caught in its wake, a part of its flow." That's not the writings of a "control freak." That's the words of a man dependent on love. "He was addicted to Louise," says a friend, Ruth Coughlin; "It was an obsession."

In his novel "Cloud Chamber," Michael Dorris wrote of a husband who learns that his wife has stopped loving him. "I despised his pliant love," she says, "spread it upon my breakfast toast and devoured it as he watched." But sometimes, she smiled at him and made promises, and "he was mine once more, settling for less and less ... I taught my husband to beg, and I despised him for his weakness."

The husband in the novel thinks: "Death struck me as the most convenient solution ... My life for some reason was an affront to her, an insult. My death would be an appropriate apology."

Dorris talked to Campbell by phone late one night: "I come back to the hotel and realize I don't have my wife, I don't have my girls, I don't have anything. How can my professional life be so perfect and my personal life a disaster?"

And when he learned of the accusations against him by his adopted children Madeline and Sava, he emailed to a friend: "Louise has clearly done everything she could to impugn me and intends that I have no contact with my children -- for years. Those are the facts. My only possibility for a life is to win a vicious trial -- by demolishing my wife and children. It is worse than I imagined."

He attempted suicide a few hours after writing that. A friend happened to call and figured out something was wrong, and alerted the police. This time the suicide attempt was unsuccessful.

Two weeks later, he succeeded in killing himself.

He had run out of hope, he came to believe he would never get his family back. Those who harbor prejudices against men will always refuse to look at the pain men go through when their marriages and families dissolve. They will continue to treat men as paychecks or label them as deadbeats, heaping whatever harsh treatment they want on them. And when someone like Michael Dorris kills himself, they will figure it's his fault.

Some of those men snap. Some turn violent. Some, like Michael Dorris, turn the violence against themselves. And when they do, society often seems blind to the emotional price that men have paid.

For Michael Dorris, hope seemed to come and go. He called a friend in 1996 saying he had returned home and found flowers on his bedroom pillow, plus chocolates and his favorite aftershave, gift wrapped and signed "Love, Louise." He thought she was coming back to him. Then, he says, he looked under the pillow and found the divorce papers.

Erdrich says that's "an absolute fabrication."

Michael Dorris met Louise Erdrich at Dartmouth College in 1972, when he was an instructor and she was one of his students. Established man, aspiring woman. He took interest in her and obviously helped and encouraged her literary career. But by the time she was moving to divorce him, her career was well established. About her decision to leave him: "There's no explanation for why you stop feeling what you're feeling," she explains.

And now she has her literary career ahead of her -- a career he nurtured and helped launch. And Louise Erdrich is oddly silent when it comes to contradicting the accusations against a man who deserved better than this.^{*175}

Dad-Bashing in 'Non Sequitor' Comic Strip

Perhaps Michael Dorris died of a broken heart -- losing his family after a heroic effort to raise children harmed by fetal alcohol syndrome. But there are still plenty of people who think that bashing fathers is wise and funny.

And apparently it's even funnier if you do it on Father's Day -- no matter what pain you might cause.

So add the "Non Sequitor" comic strip by Wiley Miller to the list of dad-bashers.

Last Fathers Day, Mr. Miller ran a cartoon showing a disc jockey musing about the day. He says "It's also a day for Dads to pause and reflect on what it mean to be a father in the nineties." (pause) "Which should create a diversion long enough for you moms to track them down and collect the arrears in child support."

Mr. Miller apparently thinks that "father" is synonymous with "deadbeat." He also seems to enjoy the idea of rubbing the wounds on a day dedicated to fathers.

In email exchanges, Mr. Miller has tried to defend this cartoon as "satire." But it's not clear what he supposedly is satirizing. He's certainly not satirizing anti-father sentiments -- he's engaging in them.

* David Streitfeld, "SAD STORY: Novelist Michael Dorris couldn't have come up with a more compelling plot. A famous writer is accused of child abuse. Kills himself. Then comes the final twist ..." *The Washington Post*, Sunday, July 13, 1997; Page F01)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Specifically, he wrote: "Apparently [you fail to] grasp the nuance of satire. One shouldn't read ANY cartoon literally. It is an abstract. The cartoon was about deadbeat dads. To say it portrayed all fathers is moronic, at best. I have done cartoons critical of white supremacists. Does that mean all white people are bigots? Of course not. So if you're not a deadbeat, then the cartoon didn't apply to you, and you should be in full support of it, as it is the deadbeats who are giving men a bad image. If you are a deadbeat, then do us all a favor and take yourself out of the gene pool."

We wonder what white supremacists Mr. Miller has criticized. Are they the ones who advocate eugenics -- taking people out of the gene pool? The unacceptable group-smear is readily apparent if Miller had said: "It's time for white people to pause and reflect -- which should give us time to catch you lynching people." The cartoon does not aim at just deadbeats. It brings up all fathers, and then reacts as if they are all deadbeats.

Miller's dad-bashing cartoon is not satire. It is pandering to political correctness. Great satirists often stand at odds to popular opinion. They do not have to pander to popular prejudice. They do not have to pretend there's a "nuance" to bashing groups of people. "Non Sequitur" is a readily forgettable piece of cultural detritus, one of those cartoons that feeds on the bottom, sucking up to popular prejudice in hopes that someone will remember it.

We remember it. We hope you will, too.

If you wish to write to Mr. Miller to object to dad-bashing, he prints his email address on each comic strip: wileytoon@aol.com. If you do write him, please, no flames, no abuse. We urge you to drop him a quick note stating that dad-bashing is not funny. Take a moment and do it now. These hacks will churn out as much safe, trite dad-bashing and man-bashing material as they can until someone tells them that it's not getting them anywhere.¹⁷⁶

Justice in the "Seinfeld" Case

We told you in the June issue of MANifesto, ... about the lawsuit being brought by a man who was fired for discussing an epi-

sode of "Seinfeld" at work. Well, terrific news! He won his lawsuit, and perhaps the tide is turning against trumped-up accusations of "sexual harassment."

Jerold Mackenzie used to work for Miller Brewing Co., a sponsor of the "Seinfeld" show. One racy episode had the office abuzz -- the fact that the show centered on the fact that a woman's name rhymed with "clitoris." Mackenzie discussed the show with a co-worker, pointing out the word on a page copied from a dictionary. The woman, Patricia Best, went to several managers complaining that the incident made her "uncomfortable," and Mackenzie was fired. This despite the fact that Mackenzie had dropped the matter instantly when she indicated she wasn't interested in pursuing the conversation.

The company claimed he was fired as the "last straw" after another accusation was made against him -- four years ago! But Mackenzie notes that Patricia Best herself had on several occasions used gutter language to describe male body parts. Then *she* got *him* fired for pointing out a dictionary word in relation to a topic being discussed at the office.

Mackenzie sued, and the jury awarded him \$26.6 million. Of that, \$18 million was for punitive damages -- to tell the company (and anyone else thinking of doing the same thing) that this was wrong and deserving of punishment.

Maybe this will send a message to the corporate world: You cannot fire men simply because you're afraid of feminists. The jurors felt that Mackenzie's superiors were merely using the accusation as a pretext to get rid of him. The jurors agreed that you cannot fire someone on a trumped-up harassment charge.

Marquette law professor John J. Kirchner said: "The problem is when the employer uses (sexual harassment accusations) as a subterfuge for their own agenda, which the jury apparently believed."

"It makes a little more sense that the jury, particularly a jury with that many women on it, is going to see through the sexual harassment part," Kirchner said.

One encouraging part of this judgment is that Ms. Best also was ordered to pay \$1.5 million to Mr. Mackenzie.

¹⁷⁶ See: <<http://idt.net/~per2/0697mani.htm>>

But we've already seen some feminist columnists who object. They are trying to portray her as an innocent bystander and claim that the judgment against her will scare other women away from filing legitimate complaints. Neither claim stands up. The feminists are not giving you all the information in this case, which is why you need sources like Per's MANifesto to tell you what the feminists don't want you to know.

First off, there was the question of whether Ms. Best was playing office politics when she made the accusation. And what the feminists won't tell you is that Ms. Best was known to use vulgar language for male body parts. And then she claims she was harassed by a reference to "clitoris!" Come on, are we expected to believe that? When feminists start painting Ms. Best as a sheltered little victim, why don't they give you the full story about Ms. Best's gutter-language references to male anatomy?

Regardless of Ms. Best's motives, if any harassment complaint is trumped up with the ulterior motive of destroying a rival, then the accuser should be held liable for damages that result. Mackenzie suffered real, genuine, severe damage from this accusation -- he lost his job and was unable to find work because of the cloud hanging over his head. If the motive was to destroy a rival by making a false or exaggerate claim, a person should be held liable for her conduct. The jurors agreed Ms. Best should be -- to the tune of \$1.5 million. They must have felt she was not an innocent bystander in all this. We tend to trust the jurors with all the facts in front of them rather than feminists who are telling you only half the truth.

And remember, there were ten women on this jury. Most women don't think the way that feminists would order them to -- they're more rational. They felt that Ms. Best was at fault.

As for this award silencing women with legitimate complaints, that's bunk. Ms. Best was not punished for making a legitimate complaint. She was found at fault for making a frivolous complaint. Are feminists saying that men should have no protection against any bogus complaints? Perhaps feminists would like a license to make any accusation that destroys any man, without fear of ever being held accountable for

whether it's true or false. If their motive is not to hurt and destroy as many men as possible, why should feminists object to holding people responsible for bogus and malicious accusations?

Take, for instance, Deborah Lukovich, president of the Wisconsin National Organization for Women. She said, "We're missing the message that that sort of discussion in the workplace is wrong." No, she's missing the fact that Ms. Best used worse language than Mr. Mackenzie, and did so with impunity. If this sort of discussion in the workplace is wrong, why aren't the rules applied to women like Ms. Best? And if NOW thinks it's wrong, why doesn't it insist that women also be punished for the same conduct? Apparently, this NOW apparatchik thinks it's wrong only if men do it and fine if women do it. That **is** the essence of feminism on a host of issues from discrimination to stereotyping to domestic violence.¹⁷⁷

One-Year Sentence for False Accusation

The shameful firing of Mr. Mackenzie reminds us of another recent case. Larry Ellison, chief executive officer of the software company Oracle Corp., had been falsely accused of harassment by a female employee. Adelyn Lee was about to be fired as an executive assistant at Oracle in April of 1993. So she made up a story that she was being terminated because she refused to have sex with Ellison. Ms. Lee used her boss's old password to break into the company's email system the morning after she was fired as an at Oracle in April 1993. She then forged an email note to try to bolster her false accusation. In fact, the forged email even helped her win an out-of-court settlement netting her a nifty \$100,000. After all, why take responsibility for your own shortcomings when smearing a man is so much more profitable?

But Ms. Lee did not get away with it. Further investigation turned up her trickery. A jury of eight women and four men convicted Ms. Lee of perjury, falsifying evidence and breaking into a computer network.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

In May, Ms. Lee was sentenced to a year in jail.*

If there is a down side here, it's that the man who was able to clear his name is one of the wealthiest businessmen in the country -- not some low-level male who could be sacrificed by a company fearing the bad publicity that feminists can inflict. He could afford the legal expenses of defending himself. In the past, false accusers got all the resources of the government behind them as the government became their "hit men." The false accuser didn't have to lay out any money -- just make a false accusation and launch an attack funded by the government. Making a false accusation is free -- or it used to be. But the tide is turning, and false accusations are no longer just another prerogative of being a feminist.¹⁷⁸

The George Franklin Case

"Recovered memories" played a part in the accusations against Michael Dorris that plunged him into suicidal despair. So it's good news that the quackery known as "recovered memory therapy" is being increasingly exposed and discredited.

"Recovered memory therapy" is strongly supported by such feminists as Gloria Steinem and Gloria Allred. They really believe that a girl could be raped every week from the cradle to college and just not remember it. They believe that you can subject women to drugs, hypnosis, and suggestive and leading questions, and the images that pop up will be "memories." It's not hard to figure out why so many influential feminists support "recovered memory therapy." It creates a bottomless well of accusations that can be made against men. These accusations are limitless because they don't have to be based on reality or physical evidence. They can be plucked out of thin air using the same techniques used by people who "channel" ancient warriors.

The strong faith of so many feminists in "recovered memories" is a sign of their willingness to believe the worst accusations against men -- even when those accusations are supported by not one bit of proof. Feminism's support for "recovered memory therapy" is an act of anti-male bigotry.

But now the pivotal case that helped launch the recovered memory witch hunt has been reversed.

George Franklin, the first person convicted based on "recovered memories," spent six and a half years in prison on a murder conviction. The sole evidence against him was the testimony of his daughter, Eileen Franklin Lipsker. She testified that one day she looked into her own daughter's eyes and suddenly remembered witnessing her father murder a little girl in 1969. There was a little girl who was killed at the time.

Testifying for Eileen Lipsker was the psychologist Lenore Terr. Terr was busy honing many of the theories of recovered memory that would lead to more prosecutions, more accusations, more families destroyed, more people sent to jail. The George Franklin case was the turning point -- the one that established a precedent for allowing recovered memories in the courtroom, the case that resulted in the first conviction. The case even became a made-for-TV movie, one of the prime venues for spreading the latest psychobabble and anti-male propaganda.

But Franklin's conviction was overturned amid overwhelming evidence that Eileen Lipsker lied about how she "recovered" her memories. In particular, she lied about the fact that hypnosis was used, and sought to have others support her lie. Also, many of the details that Eileen Lipsker supplied about the murder scene had been printed in the papers. What's interesting is that her "memories" contained the same errors as the papers did. However, the judge did not let the defense note that Lipsker could have been basing her accusations on newspapers accounts rather than memory.

There were many other mistakes in this trial. The jurors were told that Franklin had "confessed" to the crime. How? By remaining silent one time in the jailhouse when his daughter accused him.

Franklin's conviction was overturned on appeal in 1995 by U.S. District Judge D. Lowell Jensen. Then prosecutors decided against a retrial because Eileen Lipsker had become such a discredited witness. She

* (You can read more about the case by searching the archives of the San Francisco Chronicle at <http://www.sfgate.com/search/>)

finally accused her father of committing another murder, but this time union records show that he was in a meeting at the time of the slaying.

Now George Franklin is suing his daughter, her psychologists and prosecutors. He says he wants only \$1 from his daughter but is seeking unspecified damages against county prosecutors and witnesses.

They "trampled on my rights and the truth," he says. "Because I was prosecuted for a crime that I did not commit, I lost all of my life savings and spent more than 6 1/2 years in prison."

Franklin's attorney says the suit could be settled if authorities would just admit that Franklin is innocent.

We think George Franklin is entitled to every penny he can collect. The accusations and the trial were a farce. His lawsuit sends a warning to anyone making false accusations based on "recovered memories." Perhaps the abuse will stop when the recovered memory forces realize they can't just destroy innocent lives at will. They are being held accountable.

More and more, we are seeing false accusers held responsible. They should be. False accusations kill. They ruin people. They tear families apart, leaving bitter, isolated strangers. They destroy careers. It's time to tell false accusers that we're revoking their license to destroy.¹⁷⁹

What to do About False Accusations?

Here is a notice recently posted on the Usenet concerning a group that helps people defend themselves against false accusations. It is reprinted here without comment or endorsement, for your information:

F.R.O.N.T.(Family Rights Organizations National Taskforce) will convene for its 1st annual conference in Philadelphia August 22-24 at the Airport Hilton. Interested parents and professionals will learn from top national experts such as Ralph Underwager, Ph.D., Robert Fay, M.D., Charles Jamieson, Esq, Pamela Freyd, Ph.D., etc. The bulk of the seminars will focus on defense strategies for those wrongly accused of sexual abuse.

There will be further discussions on Megans Law, false memory syndrome and taint hearings. 12 CLE credits for legal practitioners have been approved by the PA.

State Bar Assn. and the PA. Supreme Court.*¹⁸⁰

Lady Thugs

Albert Yeager Jr., 41, a Jeffersonville, Indiana, pizza delivery man, suffered a pierced spleen and a broken rib when he was attacked with butcher knives.

Two teenage girls were arrested and charged with the attack. Then police found laminated cards that said "Lady Thugs Inc." and listed the nicknames of five girls.

"By definition, it just takes five people to be considered a gang, and if three of those five commit an illegal act, it is gang activity," said Jeffersonville Detective Charlie Thompson. Police have questioned a third girl, 17-year-old Kenicia Carter.

The cards list the nicknames of 15-year-old Shayla Shackelford and 14-year-old Davonna McDonald. Both are charged with attempted murder, conspiracy to commit murder, robbery, and criminal gang activity.

The girls insist they aren't a gang, just friends who hang out together. But other students tell of being threatened and harassed by the girls.

"We went to the police and filed a complaint, but nothing was ever done," Dustin Patterson said. "They just kept telling me to call back. Maybe if they had done something then there wouldn't even be a pizza guy."¹⁸¹

The Bigotry of Moderate Feminists

We don't blame those feminists who to call themselves "moderate" for trying to distance themselves from the whacko and extremist feminists. After all, the blatant man-bashers and the conspiracy loons make feminism look bad.

But perhaps the efforts of so-called moderates to distance themselves from extremists is more a public-relations ploy than a genuine rejection of man-bashing. Maybe the "moderates" really aren't trying to get away from anti-male bigotry -- maybe they're just practicing damage control so they can exercise a seemingly nicer, gentler form of anti-male discrimination.

* Those who want more information, e.g. written information, please e-mail me privately. I hope to see you there!
Dean Tong Board Of Directors, FRONT, V-P,
DeanTong@aol.com. See:
<<http://www.emrkt.com/books/dbmd.html>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

To all "moderate" feminists, we say this: if you want to discriminate against men, that's not being moderate. That's being a bigot.

Case in point: a supposed moderate feminist recently posted a Usenet message that, on the surface, seems to condemn the radical feminists and espouse a more egalitarian approach. She wrote:

"I'm really tired and frustrated as seeing only the radical feminists arguing ... in these ngs!!! It's about time some of us who espouse feminism from a more mature and all encompassing angle got on here & introduced others to a way of thinking that is a non-sexist contemporary alternative. This alternative espouses empowerment for ALL rather than subjugation of the weaker. Lets try using an ideology that embodies a value & action orientation to problem solving, and self empowerment for both males & females.

"Teddi Wight Light"

So we put some questions to her to examine her commitment to empowerment for everyone. For example, did she support affirmative action? She said:

"That depends on your definition of affirmative action - I support affirmative actions that are going to work toward creating a less gender stereotypical & divisive society for ALL. Actions that are non-violent & are working toward the recognition of the female experience as unique & disparate, but still recognising the dissimilarities in sexual preferences & social, cultural & religious backgrounds."

The second part of that answer is so much feminist-babble. But the first part is notable: she supports discrimination against men as creating "a less gender stereotypical & divisive society for ALL." (Of course her rationale for affirmative action was steeped in anti-male stereotypes.)

While trying to distance herself from extremist feminists, she still advocates anti-male policies and tries to cloak herself as a moderate. But we, who are the target of her biased and discriminatory policies, are under no obligation to see someone as "moderate" while they are advocating discrimination against us.

Specifically, she was asked: "Do you support any kind of hiring goals for women?"

"Definitely - there are not enough women in leadership positions within the workforce."

So she is pretending to be a moderate while advocating quotas on the grounds there "are not enough women in leadership positions." She didn't say "end discrimination so women have an equal chance." She demanded equal results, brought about via anti-male discrimination.

Curiously, she supports hiring goals against men by blaming women:

"Oddly, what often happens is that those women who do make it, do not readily support others to the same levels. Women do operate in different ways to achieve their goals - men use a system of mentoring, whereas, because there are fewer women in leadership positions to do the mentoring for other women, we 'network' more readily, than do males. The female support system (in the workforce) moves on a relatively horizontal level of networking as opposed to the vertical lines of mentoring used by men."

How's that for a feminist. If women don't mentor the same way men do, then let's make men pay for it by instituting hiring goals for women!

Most people become leaders because other people respect their abilities, and because the leaders put in the long work and extra dedication that creates that respect. Why should society respect someone who demands to be *given* a leadership position by virtue of her birth?

She went on to say:

"Recognising that individual personality is linked to gender identity & is a reflection of cultural influence in the socialisation of needs, desires and psychic life of both males & females - this is where feminism can respond to the masculine in a societal context. "

Unfortunately, she's responding to the masculine in a societal context by saying men should be discriminated against. Look behind the elaborate words. This woman advocates Jane Crow discrimination.

She buttresses this with mumbo-jumbo about "cultural influence in the socialization of needs." That's feminist-speak for saying that the patriarchy is to blame whenever women make choices that feminists don't like -- everything can be traced to "socialization," therefore women who play it safe are entitled to special advancement because

the oppressive patriarchy must have socialized them that way. And because the patriarchy is to blame, anyone who is male should get into the back of the bus.

Next she was tested on anti-male stereotypes. She was asked if she believed that women have been killed in the making of pornographic films.*

We weren't surprised to find that our "moderate" feminist believe this bit of anti-male propaganda. She said:

"I used to be in a law enforcement service - women have been killed doing many, many things including this. So have men. Yes, the "snuff" stuff."

Of course not one law enforcement agency anywhere in the world has ever seized a snuff film. Still, "moderate" feminists like this one swear by it.

Then we got to the nitty-gritty. Did she believe that men have social and historical advantages and that it is fair to level the playing field for women? This is the core of feminism's anti-male bigotry. It is the doctrine that justifies Ivy League and upper-class women getting preferential treatment against men who didn't have half the advantages of those women. It is the logic that has allowed white women to become the overwhelming recipients of affirmative action, edging out poor black males.

And, of course, our "moderate" feminist believed this wholeheartedly, and advocated more anti-male discrimination to "level the playing field:"

"All one has to do is a little historical research to know that of course men have had an historical & social advantage to females!!!! I could site any number of issues to support this apart from my own experiences as a female in a white male dominated social system. Fair to level the playing field - goes without saying - I only wish it could happen more quickly, less violently, and without so much anger & vilification. Anger is a precursor to change, tho"

She not only supports anti-male discrimination, she wants to ratchet up the process.

Lastly, she was asked to explain her claim that feminism is empowering for men.

"Feminism 'operates' on a continuum, as you know. When we have two genders - male & female - who are complimentary, how could the betterment of one, WITHOUT THE SUBJUGATION OF THE OTHER not benefit both?! Feminism encourages healthy personal autonomy and relationship competence for ALL persons, favours the concept of egalitarian relationships, recognizes the internal psychological dynamics of the self as well as, the socio-cultural issues of the wider environment. By removing the stereotypical role expectations of society we enable both Males & Females to redefine new & appropriate career, relationship & personal directions and expectations.

"Teddi Wight Light:"

Of course, Ms. "Light's" theories are fraught with gender stereotypes -- all of them bashing men and all of them used to justify special rights and special breaks for feminists. Her argument amounts to: I am subjugated unless I can discriminate against you. So, to live without subjugation, men should have fewer rights and protections from discrimination.

Take a look. This is a "moderate" feminist who speaks out against the radical feminists. She distances herself from the extremists. But her philosophy is still anti-male and advocates discrimination against men.

We say it again: if someone wants to discriminate against us, we have no reason to call them a moderate.

Along similar lines, another feminist recently wrote:

"I once worked for Mountain Bell....my boss asked me why I always thought there was a conspiracy against women..... I slapped a copy of the company paper on his desk which showed the company hierarchy, and said, when you can show me this paper with half women's faces on it, we'll talk. Equal opportunity, btw, is STILL the law of the land, and I, for one, will do what I can to make sure women get it."

* (In the January 1997 issue of Per's MANifesto, <http://idn.net/~per2/0197mani.htm#snuffing>, we showed how the "snuff film" is an urban legend -- but one that is adamantly supported by anti-male feminists such as Catherine MacKinnon. This is a man-bashing stereotype that blames men for a crime that doesn't exist.)

So until she gets equal results in every field, she is certain there is a conspiracy against women. Never mind that women in college are over-represented in the arts and

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

humanities. If women chose the career paths that are less likely to lead to the top, it's still called evidence of a conspiracy against them. And men will have to pay the price -- bearing discrimination until this feminist gets her equal result.

These two feminists cited above might pretend to be for "equality." But more and more I'm seeing a new wave of feminists who are not at all ashamed to drop their pretense of fair, ethical behavior. They disdain any idea of equality that does not benefit them, engage in anti-male stereotypes, admit they are interested only in rights for their own group (while demanding we support their rights) and often openly admit their interest in revenge. For example, the following feminist made this latter admission recently.

On Wed, 25 Jun 1997 07:52:55 -0400, Jean Coyle¹⁸² ... wrote:

"[What's] wrong with revenge ? Didn't guys raise the concept to a fine art form ? Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery after all ;-D
"Jean"

There you have it. The "moderates" advocate anti-male discrimination and hold anti-male beliefs, while the other one does not even pretend to be moderate.

What's the difference between the extremist feminist and the moderate feminist? Maybe it's just that the extremist is a bit more honest.¹⁸³

Here's to a Couple of Guys

Darrell Colson was leaving an Indianapolis apartment complex on July 15 when a woman by the swimming pool yelled that another woman was drowning. "I just jumped in and did what anybody else should do," says Colson. He swam down to 20-year-old Orian Williams, who was about 8 feet under water. Colson pulled her to the surface and got her to the side of the pool, where a woman helped pull Ms. Williams out.

Pretty impressive. Oh, did we tell you that Darrell Colson is paralyzed from the waist down?

He's a former tree-trimmer injured in a fall from a tree. He was in a wheelchair, which he rolled to the side of the pool so he could

dive in. Since his accident, he's been swimming for therapy.

As for why the woman who first saw the drowning victim didn't dive in herself -- well, we suspect the evil patriarchy wouldn't let her. Probably sent her a warning note beforehand not to try anything.

And next, we invite you to raise a glass to Mr. Chicken of Jackson, Michigan. Last December, the rooster was rescued nearly frozen, and he lost his feet. But he was adopted by a veterinarian, Tim England, who had a physical therapist fit him with artificial legs. It made Mr. Chicken a celebrity featured in Newsweek and newspapers from South Africa to Hawaii.

Sad to say, Mr. Chicken is no longer with us. He died with his boots on -- or at least his artificial legs. He was, alas, mauled to death while protecting the hens in his pen from some predator, probably a raccoon.

"Something chewed him up real good," England said. "The other chickens were OK, though. He was very protective of them."

Mr. Chicken was given a headstone and a proper burial -- with his artificial legs on.

You're a good man, Mr. Chicken.¹⁸⁴

SEPTEMBER 1997

WELCOME, READERS. In the movie theaters right now is a propaganda film called "G.I. Jane," purporting to show that women are tough as nails and can handle any adversity. Meanwhile, in the real world, feminists are doing their best to demonstrate that women are too delicate to stand up to naughty words, or pictures, or even a certain "Peyton place." And feminists aren't the only ones trying to pull a fast one with sexual harassment rules today -- men are getting in on the act. But men and woman alike are being affected by feminism's neo-Victorian insistence that they be treated like royalty. So we'll call this issue "Feminism: Doing A Job On Us All."

An Accusations Equals a Conviction

Joseph Holley was pleased that he had landed a new job, writing speeches for first lady Hillary Clinton.

To take the job, he had to break his lease, quit his old job, pull his kids out of school

and move his family to Washington from Texas.

Then, in the middle of this, the job offer was revoked. The White House had learned that Holley had been the defendant in a sexual discrimination and harassment lawsuit seven years ago.

Holley's employer at that time, the San Diego Tribune newspaper, had settled the lawsuit with no admission of wrongdoing. The suit had been brought by a writer Holley once supervised. He says the accusations were "absurd" and "fiction." The paper's internal review showed Holley did nothing wrong and recommended no disciplinary action against him.

But the White House said the job was off. They wouldn't even give Holley a chance to tell his side of the story.

His accuser, San Diego journalist Lynne Carrier, is applauding the decision. Yes, that's right, she's a journalist.

What she accused Holley of was allowing a "male locker room" work environment featuring coarse sexual comments.

Even if her accusations were true, it brings up the spectacle of a feminist journalist explaining to us why the First Amendment no longer works. Or at least why it doesn't apply to men.

Feminists like Carrier are demanding Victorian protection from naughty words. Carrier might demand sensitivity for herself, but the newspaper described her as having an uncontrolled temper. Sensitivity seems to be a one-way street.

Harold W. Fuson Jr., vice president and legal counsel for The Copley Press Inc., owner of the San Diego Tribune, said: "Frankly, I think Joe's the victim of a modern form of blacklisting, and I don't think it's a lot different than the 1950s version."

It would be interesting to see what would happen if the standards the White House used against Holley were applied to Bill Clinton himself. After all, he has had a few accusations of his own.¹⁸⁵

The Politics of False Accusations

Holley's case wasn't the only one to hit the White House recently.

The Drudge Report, an internet newsletter of political gossip, recently claimed that White House aide Sidney Blumenthal "has a spousal abuse past that has been effectively covered up."

The newsletter quoted an unnamed "influential Republican" as saying "There are court records of Blumenthal's violence against his wife."

The story turned out to be utterly unfounded — something planted for political purposes.

Matt Drudge, author of the newsletter, retracted the story and deleted it from his web site on American Online. He also said: "I apologize if any harm has been done."

If?

Since when do we assume there is no harm in smearing innocent people?

It appears that Blumenthal was the target of a politically motivated smear. Some Republicans had been upset over unverified abuse accusations leveled against Republican political consultant Don Sipple in Mother Jones magazine. It appears that someone put out a false story on Blumenthal as retaliation — an attempt to switch the spotlight from a Republican to a Democrat.

"Someone was trying to get me to go after [the story] and I probably fell for it a little too hard," Drudge acknowledged. "I can't prove it. This is a case of using me to broadcast dirty laundry. I think I've been had."

This sorry state of affairs shows just how politicized the entire debate over sexual harassment and abuse has become. Extremist feminists have created an overheated emotional atmosphere that is ripe for this sort of abuse. False or trumped-up accusations of harassment or abuse have become weapons in the political arena, in divorce and custody cases, and in the chase for fat legal judgments. And it is not just radical feminists who are making them. Even Republicans can get in on the act.

We wonder how far this will go, how much damage will be done, before society

* John F. Harris, "White House Rescinds Job Offer to Writer Once Accused in Bias Suit," *The Washington Post*, Monday, September 1, 1997; Page A04.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

says that false accusations are never* acceptable.¹⁸⁶

Buddy, Can you Spare a Job?

Patricia "Patti" Tehaney of Oxnard, California, recently lost her job at a termite control company. She says it's because she posed as Playboy magazine's Playmate of the Month more than twenty years ago, in May 1976. She says her employer felt that this made her far too much of a risk for sexual harassment. The company didn't want to get sued if she ever claimed harassment in connection with her nude pictures, so she says.

Her former employer says that Tehaney was fired for other reasons, but that she violated an agreement to never discuss her Playboy pictures with anyone at work. The company also says she once brought to work a copy of her nude centerfold (she says she did so reluctantly, at the request of her supervisor.)

Maybe that sounds like a raw deal for Tehaney. But with all the lawsuits and claims over sexual harassment, can we really blame the company for protecting itself?

The reader who alerted us to this story also included a quote from Warren Farrell, who said that discrimination for women would become discrimination against woman. It sounds like that might be happening to Tehaney. If we are not hyper-vigilant in protecting women, the result can be a devastating lawsuit. That can only make an employer think twice when hiring.

But Tehaney has taken her case -- and her centerfold -- to the

web. A friend put up a web page for Tehaney[†] ... in which she pleads for help in finding work. A lot of people thought the page was a gag, but Wired magazine checked into it and verified the story, and she's been written up in the December 19, 1996, Los Angeles Times.[‡]

Tehaney's page starts off by saying: "If you remember the 70s, you may remember my centerfold pictorial in the May 1976

issue of Playboy. Or my controversial cover in Nov. 1975. This may all seem glamorous, but these 70's memories have suddenly become my 90s nightmare! If you saw my recent story on NBC's Dateline (1/12) or the LA Times on 12/16, you know that all this "glamour" has cost me my job and continues to prevent me from finding a new one."

Tehaney had the page put up so that she could ask for work and for donations to see her through her job search.

But right up at the top of the page, so it's one of the first things you see, there is a reproduction of Tehaney's Playboy centerfold. She's looking for work and money, and she's showing her body.

It seems to us that any prospective employer concerned about harassment issues would have second thoughts about a woman who is using a nude picture as part of her job search.

For one thing, it invites all sorts of jokes about her "resume" and her "assets." And those jokes are precisely the type of thing that could get someone sued for harassment.¹⁸⁷

Porn Temple Pilots

If you think that the company that fired Tehaney is being overly cautious, remember that sexual harassment lawsuits over nude pictures are a very real concern, and very expensive.

For example, Continental Airlines is being sued by a female pilot, Tammy S. Blakey, who says male pilots belittled her and left pornography around the cockpit.

The company says her accusations of harassment began only after she was cited for poor attendance. It's interesting to note when a harassment accusation is made after an employee's job performance is criticized.

Blakey says she was belittled once when she found a 10-inch doll in the pilot's seat with blonde hair in a ponytail, like hers.

"I was belittled. That was uncalled for," she says.

It will be interesting to see how many thousands of dollars she thinks will soothe the trauma. (And remember, when companies are hit with large damage awards, they have to find a way to pass the cost onto the consumer. In the end, the public ends up

* Howard Kurtz, "Blumenthals Get Apology, Plan Lawsuit: Web Site Retracts Story on Clinton Aide," *The Washington Post*, Tuesday, August 12, 1997; Page A11

† At: <<http://home.earthlink.net/~tehaney/>>

‡ You can see the Wired article at:

<<http://www.wired.com/news/topframe/2205.html>>

paying for our efforts to shield women from life.)

She also said that pilots left "pornography" around the cockpit (insert bad pun here) and in flight manuals.

"It was embarrassing. I knew those guys were looking at it," she said.

Now, we don't support porn. But do people lose their rights to read what they want as soon as a woman is embarrassed to know they read it?

Maybe we can try this tactic the next time a Women's Study class reads Andrea Dworkin or excerpts from "The S.C.U.M. Manifesto."* ... Just go to your diversity department and tell them to stop the feminists from reading it because it's embarrassing. "I knew those feminists were looking at it."

Hmm. It would certainly be ironic if some of those pilots were viewing Patti Tehaney's Playboy centerfold.¹⁸⁸

G.I. Jane Needs to Train

While the propaganda film "G.I. Jane" purports to show a woman undergoing the same rigorous military training as men, the Army is finally planning to narrow the difference in its separate-and-unequal fitness standards for men and women.

In the wake of accusations of sexual harassment against women in the Army, a special Army panel conducted a gender investigation. In reporting the story, the Washington Post sounded amazed at the "surprising results" indicating that men feel aggrieved by gender bias.

What do you know! Men resent gender bias against them. Why, who ever would have thought it!

Mainly, the men are concerned about the far-easier fitness standards for women. Only half of the men said they thought that women "pull their load." But nearly all soldiers, including the women, felt that male soldiers "pull their load."

Many of the men felt that women received favorable treatment, and 28 percent of men said "women have an advantage over men when it comes to having a successful mili-

tary career." And 30 percent thought female soldiers get treated better.

Feminists will probably try to dismiss this as backlash among men who don't want women in the service. But nearly 70 percent of the men said they felt women should be allowed to do any job "for which they can qualify."

The problem is, the qualifications for women are often remarkably lower. A 25-year-old man is required to do 40 push-ups and 47 sit-ups in two minutes and run two miles in 16 minutes and 36 seconds. A 25-year-old woman must do 16 push-ups, 45 sit-ups and run the same distance in 19 minutes and 36 seconds. (The difference in running ability is notable. Apparently the Army thinks the enemy will be courteous enough to wait until the women catch up.)

The standards for women are so low that overweight smokers could pass with ease, while men often struggled to meet their higher standards. This is one form of discrimination you didn't hear feminists complaining about. There is no demand for a "level playing field" when the field tips so far in women's favor.

New rules will require women to do a few more push-ups and will slightly lower the time for the two-mile run. The number of sit-ups will stay the same.

As the Washington Post noted, men found extra burdens being placed on them when women soldiers got pregnant: "Men complained about a battalion-level fuel handler who became pregnant and was assigned a desk duty until she gave birth so her unborn baby would not be exposed to chemical hazards. There were only a few fuel handlers assigned to the battalion and because she technically remained on the unit payroll, the battalion could not request a temporary substitute." The remaining men had to take up the slack.

So women's "equal" rights translate into more responsibilities for men[†] -- as usual.¹⁸⁹

Taking a Crack at Cashing In

* See: <<http://www.wps.com/texts/SCUM-manifesto.html>>

[†] Dana Priest, "Army Moves to Toughen Fitness Standards for Women," *The Washington Post*, Saturday, September 13, 1997. Page A01

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Jamie Whited is in the money after reaching a settlement with the University of Tennessee.

Whited, a female athletic trainer, netted \$300,000 in the settlement. What terrible trauma merited giving this delicate woman more than a quarter of a million dollars?

She supposedly was mooned by quarterback Peyton Manning.

Manning says he was joking around with a male track athlete in a training room and didn't see Whited.

You can't really blame Whited for being so traumatized. What has society done to prepare women for such an assault on their delicate sensibilities?

And how could Whited have even known that an athletic trainer might one day go into a room and see a bare butt?¹⁹⁰

Fired for a "Lack of Sensitivity"

District Judge Alexander MacNichol of Maine has lost his job because he was accused of not being sensitive enough to women who claimed they were abused.

Governor King refused to reappoint MacNichol – although reappointment of judges has been almost automatic in Maine.

His supporters say MacNichol is a victim of political correctness.

"He wasn't a rubber stamp for anybody. He has always been willing to look at both sides," Henry N. Berry III, a lawyer and former political adversary, told the Associated Press. "That's what got him in trouble -- he wasn't politically correct."

Obviously, looking at both sides in domestic violence accusations is deadly for your career. Extremist feminists have been trying for years to make sure the public gets only one side – the side that paints men as evil. They've been pretty successful. Most campaigns depict domestic violence as something only men do.

What's remarkable about the case is that MacNichol is not accused of botching any cases or causing harm. He often granted the restraining orders that women sought. But he is being fired for a "lack of sensitivity."

Advocates accused him of "revictimizing" a woman seeking a protection-from-abuse order. "Revictimizing" is a feminist code-word meaning "you did not automatically believe our accusations against a man."

In this case, MacNichol actually granted the protection order to the woman he was "revictimizing." But he also ordered the woman to repay \$800 she was accused of stealing from the man and he gave the man instructions concerning small claims court. To bystanders, it sounds like MacNichol was trying to use legal channels to defuse the dispute that brought the man and woman to court in the first place.

But, to activists, this was "revictimizing" the woman.

And out he goes.

That'll teach a judge to listen to both sides of a case.¹⁹¹

Mickey Mouse Lawsuit

Billie Jean Matay, a grandmother and former Mouseketeer, sued the Walt Disney Co. for negligence after she was robbed at Disneyland in August 1995.

In particular, she says her grandchildren were traumatized after the robbery because they saw employees taking off their Mickey Mouse and Lion King costumes.

Matay had been in her car the parking lot with three grandchildren, ages 5, 7 and 11, when a robber put a gun to her neck and demanded her money. After the robbery, employees took her to a staging area where cast members were changing costumes.

In court in Santa Ana, California, she often sobbed and cried uncontrollably on the stand. She panted and sobbed so much on the stand that the judge removed the jury from the courtroom. She did manage a mournful account of how she had taken her grandkids to "share the happy feeling" at Disneyland. But she said Disneyland was negligent for allowing the robbery to happen. And she said that her grandkids were traumatized all over again when they watched employees get out of their Mickey Mouse and Lion King costumes.

Lawyers for Disney Co. said the company is not responsible because a crime takes place.

Superior Court Judge Richard Luesenbrink agreed with Disney's request to dismiss the suit. "There's nothing to suggest this incident could reasonably have been avoided," he ruled.

What a lack of sensitivity, huh?

Imagine the legal precedent this sets. Now someone could even unmask Santa Claus and not spend one day behind bars.¹⁹²

OCTOBER 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue where we take a look at some recent legal events affecting men's rights. The saddest case is that the state of Virginia seems to believe that men have little right to defend themselves against rape accusations even when those accusations leave an awful lot of questions unanswered. So we'll call this issue WIN SOME, LOSE SOME, though it seems like common sense is losing more often than not.

Marv Albert: What You Don't Know

Former sportscaster Marv Albert pleaded guilty to an assault and battery charge after a long-time lover accused him of biting her on the back and forcing her to perform oral sex. Police photographs showed a couple dozen shallow bite marks on her back, only one of which caused a minor break in the skin.

Many people are going to assume Albert pleaded guilty because he was guilty. Human life, and the legal system, are complex arenas, however, and there is much more to this case than meets the eye.

To understand this case, you have to realize that the defense was not able to present about 85 percent of the evidence it had gathered. For instance, the defense had a witness who said that Albert's accuser enjoyed sexual activity involving biting. Now that is a fundamentally important revelation in a case involving an accuser who claimed she was *unwillingly* bitten.

How could such an important piece of evidence be barred?

Because of the so-called "rape shield laws" in the United States. Every state except Maine has one. (And Maine has some common-law statutes that do basically the same thing as a "rape shield law.")

"Rape shield laws" were intended to keep the defense from smearing a rape accuser over her past sexual conduct. The defense might bring up a woman's past sexual history in order to paint her as "loose." Feminists believed that this tactic discouraged women

from making rape claims because they were afraid of being humiliated on the stand (even though their identities were *always* kept secret.) So they helped pass the "rape shield laws" preventing the defense from examining a rape accuser's past conduct.

And that is what happened in the Albert trial, which took place in the state of Virginia. Ironically, after Albert's accuser benefited enormously from Virginia's "rape shield law," she decided she didn't need the shield anymore, and she revealed her identity after the trial. She's Vanessa Perhach, a 42-year-old Vienna, Virginia, woman.

The defense had witnesses available to testify on the highly suspicious conduct of Perhach. But this evidence could not even be presented in court. The public has not heard anything close to the full story about this case.

Among the evidence the defense could not use:

- That Ms. Perhach willingly engaged in sexual activity that involved biting. Why was this disallowed under the "rape shield law?" That law is supposed to say that a woman having consensual sex is irrelevant to whether she was forced into non-consensual sex. But if she had willingly engaged in biting on previous occasions, it is strong evidence that subsequent acts might have been consensual. This was crucial to the defense, because most people assumed such biting would be non-consensual. It establishes a possible motive for her: that she could have engaged in this behavior with Albert in an attempt to set him up. Other evidence suggests this was so -- but that evidence also was barred.
- That Perhach had a pattern of threatening past boyfriends and seeking retribution against them. (Highly relevant in discussing an apparent revenge motive against Albert, who was about to marry another woman.)
- That Perhach was a chronic liar. (Why was this evidence was disallowed under the "rape shield law?" Perhaps the judge thought that telling lies was a sexual activity.)
- That she was mentally unstable. (If you were accused by a person who is unstable, you would immediately make sure people knew about it so they could better judge the accuser. Albert's defense was not allowed to do this.)

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

This actually flies in the face of law in non-rape cases, including murder cases in Virginia. A federal judge recently overturned the conviction of death-row inmate Tommy David Strickler because judge found that "undisclosed materials were suppressed by the prosecution and never disclosed." These materials concerned the credibility of witnesses against Strickler. And prosecutors are required to turn over any material that might tend to impeach the credibility of its witnesses.

What an amazing turnaround that is from the Albert sexual-assault trial in the very same state. In Albert's case, even the *defense* was barred from presenting evidence that would tend to impeach the credibility of prosecution witnesses. All because of the "rape shield law."

While feminists are now going to start referring to Albert's accuser as "the victim," it's questionable who the victim is here. Albert apparently had some kinky sexual desires. But, in effect, the so-called "rape shield law" put Albert on trial for *his* past sexual conduct and held him up to ridicule. Remember, the "rape shield law" was meant to protect women from being humiliated over their past sexual conduct when those women would, in fact, never be publicly identified. A man merely *accused* of rape is immediately identified, and his past sexual history can be paraded so that everyone can see it. That's was feminists allegedly wanted to prevent with "rape shield laws." But watch them embrace it now that it's happened to a man.

In particular, it happened because prosecutors were allowed to present an ambush witness, Patricia Masten, who gave lurid testimony saying that Albert enjoyed wearing women's garter belts and that Albert once tried to force her head down toward his groin in a hotel room. Prosecutors could present Masten as an unannounced witness because of the antiqued laws of discovery in the state of Virginia. They didn't have to tell the defense they were bringing her in. Prosecutors had time to prepare Masten for her testimony but the defense had to deal with her as soon as the prosecution sprang her on them.

So what of Masten's motives?

Well, she's hired a lawyer.

A feminist lawyer.

By the name of Gloria Allred.

According to the Associate Press, "Ms. Masten has turned down offers to tell her story for money since the trial, Ms. Allred said. But the lawyer was vague about whether Ms. Masten could seek damages from Albert in a civil suit. 'She's reserving her legal options,' Ms. Allred said."

If you keep scratching around this case, you keep coming back to the scent of money.

There is ample evidence that Perhach, the accuser, was motivated by a desire to shake Albert down for money. Perhach was caught on tape in a conversation with a cab driver discussing money and a car in exchange for his testimony against Albert. She claims she was joking. We're sure she was at least laughing -- all the way to the bank.

The cab driver has said that Perhach got into his taxi one night and said: "You're broke, I'm broke, you've got to help me."

Perhach is now taking Albert to civil court, where perhaps we will see what this case is really about: cashing in.

Perhach had a ten-year relationship with Albert. She was saving up all sorts of tape recordings of Albert. Why? Then she found out that Albert was engaged to another woman. So what really happened? We suspect that Perhach merely played her cards right. If she enjoyed being bitten during sexual activity and had done it before, it would be easy enough to arrange such a tryst with Albert. She could later say the bites were non-consensual.

And thanks to the "rape shield law," nearly all evidence of duplicity and past behavior was barred from court -- even some remarkably relevant evidence.

After Albert pleaded guilty to the lesser charges, some jurors said they had not yet seen anything that would cause them to convict Albert of the more serious forcible sodomy charge (which was dropped precisely because it was so weak.)

But it's obvious that the prosecutors were willing to continue smearing Albert over *his* past sexual conduct. Ms. Perhach claimed that Albert wanted her to find another man to engage in three-way sex with them. Was this true? Maybe, maybe not. But the defense was obviously willing to bring

up all sorts of accusations that effectively destroyed the career of a public man. It's no wonder Albert pleaded guilty to the lesser charge. The prosecution probably would have kept right on smearing him with innuendo that effectively destroyed his life. And it was the type of innuendo that never would have been allowed against the accuser -- thanks to the "rape shield law."

"Rape shield laws" have only two basic purposes. Ostensibly to protect an accuser from having her sexual past dragged up through the trial. But more importantly, "rape shield laws" are intended to make it easier to convict a man. That is the basic purpose. "Rape shield laws" deny the defense the right to present evidence.

"Rape shield laws" are seriously flawed. They need to be overhauled so that the accused can mount a defense. Barring that, the justice system should immediately stop releasing the names of men accused of sexual assault. The "rape shield laws" were meant to protect women whose identities are never revealed. But men's identities *are* immediately revealed, and all their past history can be dredged up and thrown out to the public -- precisely what the "rape shield law" shields *anonymous* women from.¹⁹³

The Man Haters Room

Every now and then we see another piece in the news media about hate groups and extremists on the web. Funny, but they never seem to include any anti-male hate groups and extremists. Maybe that means there aren't any?

Or maybe it just means someone isn't looking very hard.

For example, the existence of the "Man Haters" chat room came to light recently only because it was brought up as part of a rape accusation case.

A woman had claimed that she had been sexually assaulted by a man whom we will identify only as Sean. She told police in Pontiac, Michigan, that he pulled a knife on her and attacked her after they met on an online chat room.

But the man says that the woman went online and bragged about making a false accusation. Her forum for doing this: the "Man Haters" chat room. He says he has a

witness that this woman boasted about inventing the story.

Curiously, prosecutors are opposed to finding out the truth. They are appealing a ruling that the woman has to turn over her computer to defense lawyers and reveal her password and online aliases.

If the prosecutors wanted to get to the truth, why do they object? Why are they protecting the woman? This is the way the system works all too often -- law enforcement officials feel obligated to work only prove a woman's accusation, not to glean the entire truth. In fact, they're even trying to stand in the way of the truth.

They say they are doing it to protect the women's privacy -- because it's not certain that a search of her computer could be limited to the relevant files without revealing unrelated personal information about her.

But we note that this woman's privacy is already being protected -- the news media is not identifying her.

And we note that the man's privacy is *not* being protected. The news media has already given out his full name -- as is the habit simply when a woman brings an unproven accusation.

Her case might go down the tubes. But *his* name has already been dragged through the mud. And if her claim does prove to be false, you can be sure that her punishment will fall into two categories: wrist-slap, or none.

That's quite a major difference from what could have happened to the man had zealous prosecutors managed to notch their gunhandles with his conviction and send him to prison. There's not much privacy -- or safety -- in prison. Why are they more concerned about the privacy of a woman's computer than the safety of a man's life?

So we say again, why do the new media overlook this kind of thing when doing stories about hate online? Trying to destroy a man because you're one of the "Man Haters" is a hate crime. It is an attack aimed at a person by reason of his gender. Society is going to have to start prosecuting these attacks as hate crimes. And the news media are going to have to start looking under the rocks for the haters of all different stripes.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

And in related news, police say a Frederick County, Maryland, woman falsely claimed she was abducted at gunpoint and raped in a Pennsylvania field.

The case is notable because the false accuser was actually named in news coverage: Lisa Lyn Tregoning, 25, of Myersville, Maryland. Her accusation launched a two-state investigation Sept. 23. "It causes a lot of concern for everyone because we had to put in a lot of time and, certainly, people were concerned," said Maryland State Police Cpl. George Stottlemeyer.

Investigators noticed discrepancies in her story of two-state abduction, and she admitted she lied, police said. They said she and her husband were having marital difficulties.

Tregoning is getting the usual slap on the wrist: she faces a misdemeanor charge of making a false criminal report when she goes to court Dec. 11.

And from Wilmington, North Carolina, comes the shocking story of Junius Wilson, an elderly deaf man who had been castrated after being falsely accused of rape.

As the Associated Press reports, Wilson was placed in Cherry Hospital near Goldsboro in 1925 after being found incompetent to stand trial on a rape charge. "In 1931, a doctor signed an order for Wilson's castration, a procedure sanctioned under state law for 'mental defectives and feeble-minded inmates' accused of sex crimes. But Wilson was deaf, not mentally impaired. The charges were dropped in the 1970s but Wilson remained at the hospital because no relatives could be found to care for him."

Now Wilson has a tentative settlement with the state. He is to receive \$226,000, medical care, and a home on the grounds of the mental hospital.

This reminds us of what Gloria Allred said about Marv Albert. She said: "He shouldn't just walk out of the courthouse with probation. Some time in custody can be educational for those who endure it."

We wonder how "educational" it was for Junius Wilson to be castrated and confined to a mental hospital.

And lastly, Texas Governor George W. Bush is issuing a pardon for a man who served 12 years in prison on a rape charge before being cleared.

Modern DNA testing cleared Kevin James Byrd of the charges he was convicted of in 1985.

A 25-year-old Houston woman told police she was raped while eight months pregnant, lying in bed, with her 2-year-old child sleeping beside her. She initially claimed that a white man had raped her. Four months later she saw Byrd in a grocery store and told police that he was the attacker. But Byrd is black.

The switch in the race of the supposed attacker didn't keep Byrd from being convicted solely on the woman's word.¹⁹⁴

Men are Such Liars

Carla Coelho of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, had met a man on the internet and wanted to make a good impression.

So she sent him a photograph of herself.

Well, sort of a photograph of herself.

Actually, it was an old photo.

Oh, and she was a few pounds lighter in the picture. Well, more than a few pounds -- about 40, actually.

The man, Flavio de Oliveira e Silva, sent her pictures, too -- displaying his wealth, his cattle empire, his Lear jet. Coelho says it was "love at first link." He even gave her \$9,100 after they met, for travel expenses. They stayed at some of the fanciest resort hotels in Brazil.

But it turned out that he was a check forger wanted by the police.

And how is the woman who trimmed 40 pounds off her current girth taking the news?

"No woman was more loved than I -- nor more deceived," she says.¹⁹⁵

The Blacklisting Continues

Last issue we told you about Joseph Holley, who was denied his already-accepted White House job because he had been the defendant in a sexual discrimination and harassment lawsuit seven years ago. An investigation cleared him. But an old, unproven accusation was enough to "convict" Holley in the eyes of the White House.

Now the blacklisting continues.

Hershel Gober has withdrawn his nomination as secretary for veterans affairs because of four-year-old, unproven accusations of "sexual misconduct."

Gober denies the accusation that he made an inappropriate sexual advance to a woman at a Marine Corps event in 1995.

If his nomination had gone into confirmation hearings, Gober also was expected to face tough questions about possible conflict of interest charges. But it appears that it was the "sexual misconduct" accusation that torpedoed him.¹⁹⁶

Missing Figures

Let's discuss two issues of major concern to men interested in equal rights: the fact that feminist organizations stereotypes and demonize men; and the fact that the news media help them do it.

These concerns are usually scoffed at by feminists. (Well, you didn't expect them to take our concerns seriously.) The feminists refuse to admit that they stereotype men. And they laugh at the idea of media bias. "It's all controlled by men," they say.

Well, October was National Domestic Violence Awareness Month in the United States, and the public was subjected to a barrage of events designed to make it look as if only men are abusers.

Anyone who truly studies domestic violence knows this isn't so. In 1977, Suzanne Steinmetz released results from several studies showing that the percentage of wives who have used physical violence is higher than the percentage of husbands, and that the wives' average violence score tended to be higher, although men were somewhat more likely to cause greater injury. She also found that women were as likely as men to initiate physical violence, and that they had similar motives for their violent acts (Steinmetz 1977-78).

Of every 100 families, 3.8 experience severe husband-to-wife violence, but 4.5% experience severe wife-to-husband violence. (Straus, Gelles, Steinmetz, Behind Closed Doors: Violence in American Families (1980). Most domestic-violence homicides are attributed to men -- but only slightly. Men make up about 40 percent of spouses killed in domestic violence, according to Justice Department figures.

So this is hardly a case of only men being violent, and only women being the victims.

The crowning touch of this propaganda campaign was a march in Washington, D.C.,

on November 22, featuring 1,500 life-sized wooden figures of women murdered by domestic abusers. That's right *only* women.

Sure it was a great attention-getting device. You can see the wooden figures as a tangible representation of a real person. But if they wanted to present a true picture of domestic violence, they would need to add another thousand figures -- to get the proper ratio of men and women killed. There were a thousand missing figures at that rally -- a thousand missing lives. And amazingly, the news media never brought that up.

Given that the news media analyze all sorts of political positions and split hairs over budgets, policy decisions, campaign donations and all sorts of issues, how could it not simply note that there is more to domestic violence than this rally presented?

Instead, the rally was given free, uncritical publicity to spread its false message. And it did so in the nation's capital on the same ground where men had so recently committed themselves to admitting their offenses.

And men were not the only ones omitted.

Not represented were women like Teresa Shannon. That's curious, because her killer was her roommate.

But the roommate was female -- Cindy Boskofsky.

In many ways, the murder fit the scenario of domestic violence that feminists love to exploit in order to portray men as evil. Shannon had obtained a no-contact order two weeks before her death. Boskofsky reportedly offered someone \$10,000 to kill Shannon. And a witness said quoted Boskofsky as saying "If I can't have (Shannon), nobody will."

If Shannon had been killed by a man, the slaying would have been held up as evidence of the "patriarchal" beliefs of men who want to own and control women. Feminists try to claim that domestic violence is the result of "patriarchal" attitudes. That gives them purchase to claim that domestic violence is something that only men do only to women. It gives them a rationale for tracing all violence to men.

This entire rally, supposedly dedicated to awareness of "domestic violence," did not mention even one of the following:

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Men killed by women. (Pamela Smart, Betty Broderick and the Scarsdale Diet Doctor Murder must not count as domestic violence.)

Women killed by women. (Shannon doesn't count as domestic violence.)

Children killed by women. (Susan Smith, Darlie Routier, and Diane Downs must not count as domestic violence.)

If this rally had portrayed only white people who had been killed by black people, the bigoted intent would have been perfectly clear. If they had tried to link being violent with being black, the racist intent would have been clear. Only a Klan group would do something like that. But there they were, "respectable" feminists, doing precisely the same thing with regard to men. And the news media giving them free publicity for doing it.

Shannon's death -- with the hit-man element, stalking, sexual jealousy, etc., had all the features of a lurid, made-for-TV movie -- *if* the killer had been male. Shannon's death has not gotten a made-for-TV movie. It has not gotten much attention at all. It did not even merit a cardboard cutout in the march in Washington over the weekend.

Judging by the actions of feminists, Shannon's life did not count for very much -- simply because of the sex of the person who killed her.¹⁹⁷

Clinton to Fathers: Drop Dead

President Clinton issued a proclamation declaring September 28, 1997, as Gold Star Mother's Day, the day to honor women who lost a child in the military service.

He proclaimed: "For America's Gold Star Mothers -- who have lost a child in the service of our country -- the grief is particularly acute. The sons and daughters they cherished through the years, whom they guided and comforted through all the joys and heartaches of childhood and adolescence, were torn from their lives forever with cruel and sudden force. These mothers must live the rest of their lives knowing that the talents and ambitions of their children will never be fulfilled, that each family gathering or celebration will be shadowed by the absence of a dearly loved son or daughter."

Clinton's animosity toward fathers is a hallmark of his administration, stemming

from his own childhood experiences that have given him a stereotyped and hostile view of fathers. So, is he saying the grief is not particularly acute for fathers? If not, why is there no mention of fathers anywhere in his proclamation? He certainly has included women when discussing groups primarily of men. The absolute lack of any hint that these children also had fathers merely underscores how disposable and invisible fathers have become -- until they can be pilloried for doing something wrong.

Clinton goes on: "Yet despite the enormity of their loss, America's Gold Star Mothers have continued to do what comes naturally to mothers: to comfort, to nurture, to give of themselves for the benefit of others."

Again, there isn't a father anywhere in the land who does this?

Clinton says: "Gold Star Mothers remind us in so many poignant ways that true love of country often calls for both service and sacrifice." Correct, Bill. Most of the people paying that sacrifice on the battlefield have been men.

"For these reasons and more, and in recognition of the special burden that Gold Star Mothers bear on behalf of all of us, we set aside this day each year to honor and thank them ..."

And fathers -- you can drop dead.¹⁹⁸

Pants Suit

A man is setting a lawsuit against a Houston, Texas, company after three female co-workers pulled his pants down.

The man said he mentioned to co-workers at Sterile Reprocessing Services, Inc., a medical supply company, that he sometimes did not wear underwear. So they decided to see for themselves.

"One female supervisor said she thought his co-workers considered his statements as an invitation for an 'inspection.'" according to the Associated Press.

"All three women pulled the plaintiff's pants to his knees and caused him to fall," according to documents filed by his attorney, Peter Brannan. "While struggling to get away, they dragged him across the floor by his pants." After that, they would refer to him by a derogatory name.

Unfortunately, none of the women were targeted in the lawsuit, which was brought

only against the company. Once again an act that would be seen as a terrible violation of a woman's rights goes unpunished when the offenders are women.

UPDATE: Tammy S. Blakey, the woman we told you about last issue, has won \$875,000 because she says she was exposed to naughty pictures at Continental Airlines. The airline was ordered to pay that amount to Blakey, a pilot who sued for "sexual harassment."

As the Associated Press reported: "Continental got a partial victory, though, because jurors declined to make the airline pay any punitive damages. They also decided that the airline had not retaliated against Blakey or discriminated against her regarding her pay or assignments, finding only that there was discrimination in the hostile work environment she faced."

Once again feminism seems to tell us that women are weak, frail and virginal creatures who must be protected -- or compensated with big chunks of money.

"I'm not disappointed" that she lost her bid for punitive damages, Blakey said. "The money wasn't as important as the message."

Really? We wonder which she'd take if she had to choose between the two.¹⁹⁹

Humor:

How to Deal with Feminists

After the feminist revolution, a couple of men were sentenced to death for oppressing women. (They had been caught saying that William Shakespeare was a better writer than Margaret Drabble.)

On the day of their execution, the feminist guard comes to the door of their cell and says: "I'm supposed to give you each 50 lashes with a cat-o'-nine-tails, but I'm tired and I'll only give you 25."

The first man claps his hands with joy and says, "This is wonderful, this is so very nice of you!"

After she is done flogging them, the feminist guard says: "Prisoners usually get served a last meal of rancid gruel mixed with bugs. I'm giving you rancid gruel without any bugs."

The first man says "Excellent! That is truly wonderful!"

After they finish the gruel, the feminist guard comes back and leads them out to the courtyard before a firing squad. She says: "My orders were not to let you have blindfolds in front of the firing squad. But I'm going to strip you naked, tear your clothes to shreds, and give you a scrap of your own clothing to use as a blindfold."

The first man says "This is absolutely wonderful!"

Finally the second man can't stand it any longer and he says, "What are you praising this feminist for? She's about to have us killed."

"Keep quiet you fool," the first man whispers, "I'm trying to encourage the moderates."²⁰⁰

Gravity Holds Women Down

It's time to discuss the extra burden that gravity places on women trying to rise in the world, says Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname, president of the Propaganda Organization for Women.²⁰¹

"Feminist scientists on an archaeological dig in Mesopotamia have discovered illustrations of women who seem to be floating in the air," Hyphenated-Lastname says. "This cutting-edge research indicates that there once was a time when gravity did not exist. In fact, these artifacts indicate that society was once gender equal, and women held most high offices of power and controlled the television remote."

"But all this changed with the onset of western patriarchal societies that wanted to keep women down. If there were no distinctions between men and women, patriarchal oppressors had to invent them. And if there was no gravity, the patriarchy had to invent that, too."

"Gravity is designed to benefit men, who have thicker bones and greater upper-body strength. Today, we see the results everywhere of the patriarchy's efforts to keep women down. Gravity causes women to fall to their deaths out of windows or down stairs. It makes buildings collapse, killing women and children. It damages women's cars when some inconsiderate construction worker topples from the tenth floor and bounces off the hood. Gravity makes the complete, leather-bound editions of Carrie Chapman Catt fall off my bookshelf and

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

give me such a smack I can hardly see straight."

"Navy pilot Kara Hultgreen would not have crashed her jet except for gravity. Clearly, she was set up to fail."

"Women seek treatment for depression at far higher rates. Obviously, more women are feeling 'down.' Gravity is just another way in which women's health is being shortchanged."

"This oppression is historical, the product of white, western men who wanted to hold onto power. The laws of physics were written long before women had the right to vote. If women had had more input, the laws of physics would have been kinder, gentler, and more nurturing, rather than the competitive, conflict-oriented mode of men. Isaac Newton, a typical dead white European male, was obsessed with 'opposing' reactions, even if he hypocritically admitted that some of them were equal. When he declared that for every action there is opposed an equal reaction, he was doing nothing less than defining the backlash. If women had had a chance to shape these laws, their conflict-free style of interaction would have made sure that there were no opposed reactions. All reactions simply would have been equal."

"We can undo the oppressive, patriarchal mindset that would have us believe that gravity really represents the 'natural' order of things," says Hyphenated-Lastname. "It will require spending money on programs to elevate girls' self esteem so that they are not held down by artificial concepts of patriarchy."

"This will cost a lot of money," says Hyphenated-Lastname.

"But I'm up for that."²⁰²

NOVEMBER 1997

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue where we can proclaim that the mainstream news media is actually catching up to Per's MANifesto. That's right, all those "radical" and "extremist" facts you've been reading in MANifesto are finally being acknowledged by such liberal sources as the New York Times. Maybe feminism's deathlock on the news media is finally slipping. We hope so. At least there are some people in the main-

stream media who seem at long last willing to admit that society has some biases against men and in favor of women. In fact, they now notice that women can get away with murder. That's why we'll call this issue "NOT GUILTY BY REASON OF OVARIES."

(Note: There will be no December issue -- Per's MANifesto is taking a holiday break. It will return in January with a special issue on feminism and women's health -- it promises to be an excellent, information-packed issue with lots of material you can use to refute feminists' claims that they are somehow being "shortchanged" on health or discriminated against because of physical standards.)

Until then, we wish all good men and women of the world the happiest of holidays and a wonderful New Year!

Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries

Matthew Eappen was eight months old when he was violently shaken and slammed down with the force equal to being tossed out a second story window. He died of internal injuries and a skull fracture.

Louise Woodward was a British nanny -- or au pair -- who admitted that she shook and roughly treated a child she resented as "spoiled."

Woodward spent less time in jail than little Matthew Eappen spent on this earth. Her case points up once again the amazing prejudice in favor of women -- both in our courts and in society in general.

Baby killers are usually considered the lowest of the low. In prisons, the inmates convicted of molesting or killing infants often are brutalized by the other inmates. In our neighborhoods and workplaces, just a whiff of this charge is usually enough to cast a permanent stigma on the accused.

Unless, it would appear, you are a woman.

Let's be frank. We believe Louise Woodward is guilty. The amazing thing about this case is not that she got away with it. There are men and women who *do* beat the system. This case is remarkable mostly for showing how huge segments of society cannot believe that a woman can be guilty.

Murder cases come and go. Few attract the sort of supporters -- "fans" might be a better word -- who stood in crowds in Europe and the United States, waving signs, cheering

and weeping for Louise Woodward. They shrieked, they hugged, they cried. They opened champagne. These people did not care about the evidence. They formed an emotional reaction -- and an emotional attachment -- along some very ugly lines. On one side was Matthew Eappen -- mixed-race and male. On the other, Woodward -- white and female.

Right away, let's dispose of some of the smoke that Woodward's legal defense team blew across this case. They put some hired gun on the stand who claimed (while being paid to do so) that Matthew suffered some earlier injury that might have somehow "reopened" when Woodward shook him. But after the trial, a group of fifty independent doctors came out and said that the defense's claims just didn't make sense. The way the defense described an old head wound "reopening" just doesn't happen.

This made no difference to Woodward's public. They had seized on a paid-for piece of testimony and treated it as irrefutable proof. They didn't want to hear any more. Their minds were made up.

At Per's MANifesto, we have a phrase for this sort of emotional, damn-the-evidence outlook. It's called "not guilty by reason of ovaries."

There were other factors at work beside the prejudice in favor of females -- especially one who kills a male. For one thing, Woodward had been brought to the United States by a quasi-governmental organization that arranges such trips as a cultural exchange. EF Au Pair and its affiliated organization, EF Education, realized just how bad it could be for them if Woodward was convicted. That would open them to being sued by Matthew's parents, Sunil and Deborah Eappen, for being negligent in bringing her to the United States.

So EF Education pumped \$750,000 into Woodward's defense. That type of money buys and awful lot of justice.

But money wasn't the only factor, or even the most important factor. Given the same physical evidence, and the same defense testimony, we think that any man would have landed in prison for several decades to life. And there would have been no wrought-up crowds weeping for him and demanding "justice."

The defense's own tactics indicate how much they were relying on pro-female bias.

Key to this case was that Woodward's defense team wanted the jury to have only the option of acquitting her or convicting her of murder. The defense did not want jurors to have the option of convicting her of a lesser charge of involuntary manslaughter.

Experts agree that the defense thought the jurors would refuse to convict her of murder, leaving acquittal as their only option.

Right away we can see the bias at work. This strategy was based on the assumption that jurors would refuse to believe the worst about Woodward, a young, white female. They would refuse to think of her as evil, as causing the death of an infant. Or they would think she was responsible but could not bear the thought of punishing her so harshly. So they would let her go.

But the jurors said they knew that, one way or another, premeditated or not, Woodward had caused the baby's death. They were left with only two choices that didn't quite fit exactly right. They could acquit, or convict her of murder. Maybe her actions didn't fit all the technicalities of murder, but she had snuffed out a human life. They couldn't just let her go. So, on October 30, they convicted her rather than see he go scot free.

That set up the defense's appeal to have the conviction thrown out. The defense argued that Woodward was not guilty of malice (in the legal sense), so she could not be convicted of murder.

Middlesex Superior Court Judge Hiller B. Zobel listened to their appeal, and agreed. He reduced her conviction to involuntary manslaughter.

At Per's MANifesto, we suppose there might be some legal and technical merit to that decision. The true miscarriage of justice was still ahead.

Judge Zobel then set Woodward free by reducing her sentence to the 279 days she had already spent behind bars. Zobel said he wanted a "compassionate conclusion" to the case.

We don't think Woodward brought a very compassionate conclusion to Matthew Eappen's life.

After reducing the charge to involuntary manslaughter, Zobel then blatantly ignored state sentencing guidelines that call for a

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

three to five year prison term. He let Woodward off with a fraction of that.

And this is where the case gets truly bizarre.

It was Zobel himself who brought all this about.

Judge Zobel could have turned down the defense's request that Woodward face only a murder charge. Zobel could have had her face the involuntary manslaughter charge as well. But he did not.

And that is very curious.

We know why the defense wanted Woodward to face only a murder charge -- they believed it would lead to an acquittal.

Why, then, did *Judge Zobel* want Woodward to face only a murder charge?

Zobel's decision in effect says that the only charge Woodward should have faced is the one that he, himself, would not let her face. As prosecutors put it, the judge ultimately "determined that the only guilty verdict which did not constitute a miscarriage of justice was the one he refused to allow the jury to consider."

"If this judge could arrive at this result upon these facts," the prosecutors said, "then every trial judge would have the power to nullify the law, silence the people's elected voice, and dispense with the jury system altogether."

Was the system working all along in the favor of a female? Was there a bias against harshly punishing a woman accused of bashing the life out of a male?

Prosecutors are taking the unusual step of appealing Zobel's decision, asking that Woodward be sent back to prison.* Perhaps there can still be justice in this case.²⁰³

The Right to Sniff Glue

In Winnipeg, the Manitoba Court of Appeal ruled that the courts cannot stop a pregnant woman from sniffing glue and solvents, despite the harm it will do to the unborn child.

The woman has three children. Two were born suffering the affects of her glue-

sniffing, and all three are in the care of child welfare authorities.

Child welfare workers had tried to force the 22-year-old woman into a drug treatment program. But the court sided with the mother and her right to damage her child and create a burden the rest of society will have to bear.

"The mother's right to sniff solvents may not seem of much importance, but I do not see how a court can select which conduct harmful to an unborn child should be restrained and which should not," wrote Justice Kerr Twaddle.

Twaddle, indeed.

Her lawyer, Dave Phillips, said "I think she'll be very relieved that her ordeal is over."

Of course, the damage to the children will never be over.

But the response of some feminists to this case has been typical: stressing a woman's "rights" over the health of a helpless baby. As one feminist commented on this case: "Women have the SAME RIGHTS that men have in making choices over what goes into and out of their bodies. If women are taking an ILLEGAL SUBSTANCE, they can be incarcerated the SAME way men are incarcerated, and for the same duration."

That might be true as far as it goes. But when she's pregnant, she's responsible for another human life. Feminists who would throw men into prison for cutting off the flow of child support will turn around and defend women who cut off the flow of oxygen.[†]

And in another case, a baby was born with a pellet lodged in his brain after his mother shot herself in the stomach in an attempt to kill the child.

The child, Johnathan Drummond, was in good condition in an Ottawa hospital after doctors removed the pellet from his brain, but doctors were not sure what the long-term health effects would be.

The mother, Brenda Drummond, was charged with attempted murder for trying to kill the boy in her womb. But her lawyer

* Pamela Ferdinand, "Prosecutors File Appeal Urging Court to Return British Au Pair to Prison," *The Washington Post*, Wednesday, November 26, 1997, Page A03. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1997-11/26/0421-112697-idx.html>>

[†] Scott Edmonds, "Court can't stop pregnant woman from sniffing glue," *Canadian Press*, Sept. 12, 1996. Available at: <<http://www.southam.com/nmc/waves/depth/health/fetus091296.html>>

says the charges should be thrown out on the grounds that life doesn't begin until birth.

Maybe it's comparing legal apples and oranges, but we know of men in the United States who have been sent to prison for killing a fetus. Such cases involve men who either deliberately injured a pregnant woman, or who were involved in automobile crashes in which a pregnant woman lost her fetus.

Apparently the sentiment is "you can kill it as long as it's yours."²⁰⁴

Wrist Slap for a Rapist

Next up in our miscarriage-of-justice sweepstakes: convicted child rapist Mary Kay LeTourneau. She's the Washington state school teacher who seduced one of her students, a 13-year-old boy, and got pregnant and delivered the child's child. For using her status as a teacher to have sex with a student, LeTourneau got off with a slap-on-the-wrist sentence of six months.

As the Associated Press reported, the "justice" system isn't so forgiven when men are convicted of similar charges: "Last year, a junior high school teacher was sentenced to nearly four years in prison for having sex with a 15-year-old girl. He was convicted of third-degree rape of a child, third-degree child molestation and communicating with a minor for immoral purposes. In 1995, a former middle school hall monitor was sentenced to three years for third-degree child rape -- having sex with a 14-year-old girl."

The LeTourneau wrist-slap has angered some child advocates.

"The facts are that as a teacher, she used one of her students to satisfy her sexual desires. You just don't do that," said Patrick Gogerty, executive director of Childhaven, a Seattle agency for neglected and abused children. "Are there rules governing this? I don't think it should include a slap on the wrist. It should be more than this."²⁰⁵

Meanwhile, Back at Responsibility...

Meanwhile, also in Washington state, James E. Winkler is facing jail time on a charge of raping his wife.

Not forcible rape. Winkler is 20, and he had sex with his girlfriend four days before she turned 16, the age of consent in Washington.

Then they got married in March.

But Skagit County prosecutors charged Winkler with third-degree child rape, a felony. He pleaded guilty to a reduced misdemeanor charge. His wife, Amanda, spent several hours jailed in juvenile hall for refusing to testify against him.

Sentencing is set for Dec. 12. Chief Deputy Prosecutor David Wall wants Winkler to spend a year in the county jail.

And speaking of men spending time behind bars: Two men who served 11 years for a rape they did not commit have been freed because of DNA evidence that was not allowed at their original trial.

A Cook County, Illinois judge vacated the convictions of Donald Reynolds and Billy Wardell. The judge ordered new trials, but prosecutors say they are dropping the charges.

They were convicted of raping a University of Chicago woman in May of 1986. Reynolds asked for DNA testing, but the judge rejected the request, saying the procedure had not gained wide acceptance. Reynolds was able to have the test done recently, and the results cleared both men.

Both were serving 55-year sentences and would not have been eligible for parole until 2013.²⁰⁶

Flinn Flam, Part II

Kelly Flinn doesn't know how to quit when she's ahead.

Flinn is the former Air Force B-52 bomber pilot who got special treatment when she faced court-martial for disobeying orders. Flinn tried -- very successfully -- to paint herself as a female victim of male double standards. She claimed that she had a love affair and was punished for it because she's a woman. She cried "victim" so loudly and effectively that she was allowed to leave the Air Force with a general discharge for offenses that men have spent time in military prisons for.

In the May issue of Per's MANifesto,[†] ... we exposed a lot of the holes in Flinn's story.

* "Baby born with pellet in brain released from hospital," *Canadian Press*, July 24, 1996.

† See: <<http://idt.net/~per2/0597mani.htm>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

But now Flinn is back with the same old story in a new book, and it looks like the news media are finally catching on to the facts that we pointed out all the way back in May.

In her new book, "Proud To Be," she continues to play the victim even while admitting to the offenses she committed. She admits to a drunken one-night stand with an enlisted man. That's a blatant violation of the rules against fraternization. Then she starts an affair with Marc Zigo, who is married to an enlisted woman. When it's found out, she lies to her superiors about it and disobeys direct order to break off the affair. She signs an order agreeing to cease all contact with Zigo, even though she was actually living with him.

Fraternization, adultery, disobeying a direct order, lying to superiors -- it all adds up. Flinn was flying airplanes with nuclear weapons. When someone is piloting a cargo of death capable of starting World War III, obeying orders should not be considered an option.

But this time, while Flinn is rehashing her old story, the military isn't sitting still. The Air Force refrained from comment while Flinn was facing court-martial, so as to not prejudice the trial. But this time, all bets are off. The Air Force says it has no reason to keep quiet while Flinn continues to distort the truth.

And that seems to have a lot of people in the news media worried.

There were an awful lot of them who seemed to be cheerleaders for Flinn, who were willing to uncritically report her version that she was a poor, innocent, love-struck woman being beaten up by a macho military that lets men get away with the same thing.

A lot of the news stories functioned almost like press releases for Flinn. They promoted the line that Flinn was being punished for an affair. She wasn't. She had been warned to break off the affair, and if she had done so, she could have gotten away with it. Instead, she lied and disobeyed orders, and *that's* what she was being punished for. But so many papers carried the "punished for a love affair" line that enormous public pressure was applied, and Flinn got special

treatment for committing offenses that have sent men to military prisons.

As USA Today says, "Media critiques have found that early news stories emphasized Flinn as a pioneering female aviator and the Air Force as propagator of a macho military double standard. 'Much of the reporting from the Flinn battlefield came up short,' Tony Capaccio wrote in the October American Journalism Review."

Part of that was due to the fact that Flinn seemed much more media-savvy than the Air Force. Robert Lichter of a media watchdog group, the Center for Media and Public Affairs, said "The generals showed they're better at dropping bombs than spinning news."

Granted. But somebody in the news business had to let themselves be spun. It's supposed to be their job to get the facts and report them. Instead, they seemed remarkably willing to passively pass along Flinn's version of being a victim of the male-dominated military.

At Per's MANifesto, we wish we could claim to have some secret, well-connected source for all the facts we revealed. But we don't. We just gave a hard look at the plain facts that were coming out despite all of Flinn's spin control. The news media had all these facts, too. It's just that they buried them at the bottom of their stories or glossed over them. The facts were always there. You just had to look at them.

And now the news media seem to have a bit of incentive to finally look. That's because the Air Force isn't restrained by considerations over Flinn's court-martial anymore, and it's shooting down her story left and right.

That leaves a lot of news organizations backtracking. Lichter says, "If journalists are convinced they have been snookered, they will get their backs up."

But look. How could so many professionals be so snookered for so long? Those people work at this full time, with far more resources than Per's MANifesto has. And yet this newsletter was able to bring you the facts that the mainstream media are just now acknowledging.

Maybe this was not a case of them being "snookered" so much as being willing ac-

complices who now have to cover their tracks.

As for Flinn, she's still saying she was victimized "All because I loved the wrong man," one with a perfect "soccer player's body." "I could drop weapons of mass destruction," she writes. "But I had no knowledge of the workings of the human heart."

Bunk.

When men can't control their sexual urges, they don't get away with blaming it on their heart. It's usually another part of the anatomy that takes the blame.

When men hop into bed like this despite the risks and consequences, feminist will often say "He's thinking with his crotch." Flinn was thinking with *her* crotch, then trying to claim to be swept away by love. But keep in mind, she was taking the husband of another woman. That's not precisely a very loving thing to do.

For someone who had "no knowledge of the workings of the human heart," Flinn certainly managed to manipulate an entire nation and most of the news media. And now she's out with a book to cash in on it all.

We think Flinn is more than aware of the workings of the human heart.*

And to her it must sound like a cash register.²⁰⁷

The New York Times Plays Catch-up

Men's rights activists are used to being called extremists. Per's MANifesto Newsletter gets its share of abuse from feminists who want to shout it down with personal insults and innuendo.[†]

But many of the ideas that were accused of being "radical" or "misogynistic" when men first spoke them are increasingly working their way into the mainstream.

The recent cases involving Louise Woodward and Mary Kay LeTourneau are getting people to talk about a basic fact that men's rights advocates have always noted: the justice system contains biases against men.

Writing about the Woodward case, the New York Times* says: "It is safe to say, after all, that the nation would not have

become all that wrapped up in the case of a baby who died at the hands of, say, his mother's boyfriend. There's just something about a woman behind bars that sets people off. ... It also raised the question of whether men and women are treated equally by the criminal justice system. The answer seems to be no, with many explanations, depending in part on the political stripe of who is explaining."

"There's a tendency to believe in female innocence," said Cathy Young, a researcher at the Cato Institute and vice president of the conservative Women's Freedom Network, who argues that offenders who are women are treated more leniently than men. "Feminists haven't paid attention when gender bias goes in the other direction."

But while the Times makes a positive step in examining the issue, it still falls into the old trap of looking at convictions and prison populations to judge how often men commit crimes compare to women. The Times says: "The bare data make clear that women don't get into serious trouble as commonly as men; they make up 8 percent of Federal and 5 percent of state prisoners, according to the Justice Department. Even as criminals, they are much less violent than men; they account for just one of seven arrests for violent crimes."

Sorry, Times, but that bare data does *not* make clear that women don't get into serious trouble as commonly as men. What it makes clear is that they don't get *punished* for it as harshly as men do. Remember the Louise Woodward of this world when you're counting prison population. Woodward got away with only 279 days in prison when the sentencing guidelines for the more *lenient* conviction still called for three to five years. Some of those men you're counting are in prison on a charge for which the women would not have been arrested or convicted, or would have been given a lighter sentence. Calculate up all the Louise Woodward who get lighter sentences, balance that against men getting longer sentences, and *then* we'll talk about prison populations. Prison populations do not reflect who is doing crime. It only reflects who is doing time.

The Times also says: "One widely cited study of Pennsylvania courts, for example,

* Andrea Stone, "Flinn's story may not fly on book tour," USA TODAY.

[†] See our letters page at: <<http://idt.net/~per2/letters.htm>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

found that men were 11 percent more likely than women to be imprisoned for the same crimes, even after adjusting for the greater number of prior offenses by men. The researchers said judges viewed female defendants "as less 'dangerous,' as less culpable than their male co-defendants and as having more responsibilities and ties to the community."

It's interesting that feminism has let this attitude ride. If a man and a woman run a business, feminists want the woman credited with doing equal work. But if that business is robbing banks, feminists insist that the man was the brains behind the operation.

And finally, the Times falls back on the old stereotype that violence is a male thing. "As for the tiny number of violent female criminals, the data cannot tell much; these women are by definition anomalous." Excuse us, Times, but violent *male* criminals are anomalous, too. Most men are not violent criminals. And in domestic violence cases, about half of it is committed by women, despite feminism's best efforts to paint it as a male thing. Violent women are not so rare. It's the *coverage* of violent women that's anomalous.

Why is it so anomalous? Well, a lot of the violence that women do is covert. Take the case of a Tacoma, Washington woman who was caught on a hidden video camera cutting off the air supply of her hospitalized daughter. Andrea I. Guzman pleaded guilty to first-degree assault and was sentenced to nearly 10 years in prison. If hospital officials had not become suspicious and hidden the camera, she might have gotten away with it. And in Virginia, Fairfax County police have charged Elvia Garcia with killing her 11-day-old baby boy, with an overdose of a prescription painkiller. These covert assaults are the types of crimes that are harder to detect.* When they are detected, the woman goes into a system blatantly biased in her favor, seeing her as less dangerous and less culpable.²⁰⁸

Equality in the Gutter

Teri Taylor of St. Clair Shores, Michigan, is bringing a lawsuit over separate men's and women's bowling leagues.

Good for her, you say. Break down the gender barriers that keep women out. You go, girl!

Well, actually she's not suing to be able to play in the men's leagues. She's suing to stay *out* of the men's leagues.

Taylor has a 217-pin average, about 30 pins better than her nearest competitors in the women's league. Other women got tired of losing to her, knowing they had little chance for the prize money if Taylor was bowling. So they started dropping out and refusing to bowl against her.

That was bad for business at the bowling alleys. So Universal Lanes in Warren, Michigan, told her she had to compete in a men's league.

So Taylor is suing to avoid having to bowl against men. In a lawsuit before Macomb County Circuit Judge George Steeh, she says she is being denied full enjoyment of a public facility because of her sex. And that would be sexual inequality, of course.

Equality, you see, is whatever a woman says it is. If she wanted into the men's league, she'd sue to get there. If she wants to stay out, she'll sue for that, too.

Taylor wants \$10,000 for her embarrassment at the situation.[†]

We'd say her lawsuit is proof she's beyond embarrassment.²⁰⁹

More Choices Without Voices

A teenager has been charged with dumping her newborn son in a toilet in a bus terminal in Atlantic City, New Jersey, while she was there on a gambling junket in July. She is sixteen years old. Fortunately the full-term baby -- a boy -- was pulled out of the toilet alive and taken to a hospital.

A more famous case in New Jersey, of course, involves 18-year-old Melissa Drexler, of Ocean County, N.J. She gave birth at her prom, stuffed the helpless baby into a trash bin, and went back to the dance. Also, a teenage mother is accused of giving birth on the New Jersey shore, then stuffing

[†] Kevin Lynch, "Bowler sues to stay in league of her own," *The Detroit News*, Friday, October 10, 1997. Available at: <http://detnews.com/1997/metro/9710/1010100127.htm>

* Laura Mansnerus, "Sometimes, the Punishment Fits the Gender," *The New York Times*, November 16, 1997.

the baby in a gym bag and taking it back to her home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, where it was found three days later.

And a Voorhees, New Jersey teenager is charged with aggravated manslaughter of her newborn son. An autopsy showed that the 7-pound boy was born alive and died of unattended delivery and asphyxiation.

What's going on in New Jersey? It could, of course, be a series of coincidences that some horrible baby-dumping has occurred there recently. After all, this sort of callous disposal of helpless children has taken place in other states.

But it's worth noting that New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman recently vetoed a state bill that would have outlawed partial birth abortions. That's the procedure in which a viable baby is partially deliver with just its head left in the birth canal so the doctor can suck out its brains with a tube and then the corpse fully withdrawn. Leaving the head inside the birth canal for this procedure gives them a fig leaf of legal protection to claim that the operation is an abortion.

When Governor Whitman vetoed the bill to outlaw this procedure, she sent the message that whatever a woman wants to do is just a matter of her "privacy." If you can kill a helpless infant merely because his or her head is still in the birth canal, why stop there? Why mess with that window-dressing technicality of where the infant's head is? When we've reduced human life to mere matters of "choice" and "privacy," when we've cut corners on our ethics so that you can suck a baby's brains out because its head is still inside a woman's body, then why even bother drawing the line with dumping babies in garbage cans? In one sense, the woman who are doing this are merely guilty of doing it in the wrong place. Do it in an operating room under the guise of "partial birth abortion," and you're within the law and get all sorts of hugs and support from feminists. The result is still the same -- a helpless child killed because she or he was inconvenient for someone. If we tell girls and women that killing their babies is okay, why do we act surprised when they do it themselves?²¹⁰

More Moral Lessons

You've probably had to sit through some feminist lectures about how women should be running everything because they are morally superior.

So here, from the front lines of moral superiority, some recent dispatches.

In Peoria, Illinois, an 11-year-old girl demonstrated how she choked the life out of her 2-month-old half brother because she was tired of having to care for him. Using a doll, she grabbed it by the neck and twisted. "I just twisted his neck around. I heard a tearing sound, then he stopped breathing." A judge convicted the girl of first-degree murder. She could be sent to a youth home or held in prison until she turns 21.

In Chicago, a woman who set up a fund-raising drive for an abused girl has collected something like \$300,000, but she has turned over only \$1,000 to the girl's family. Beverly Reed, described as a community organizer, started collecting money for the family of a nine-year-old girl, who became known as "Girl X" after she was horribly assaulted and maimed in a housing project. Reed says the money is still in the bank and she's concerned about giving the family more money because it might affect their welfare status. Meanwhile, she admits paying herself \$20,000 in "administrative costs."

"Chicago newspapers carried reports that Reed had been convicted of possession of a controlled substance in 1988 and forgery in 1990. State officials said Reed failed to list any such convictions on the charitable trust papers."

And in Albany, New York, Hazel Dukes pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor larceny charge. Dukes, former president of New York City's Off-Track Betting Corp., took more than \$13,000 from a leukemia-stricken woman who had asked Dukes to help her while she was sick. Prosecutors say Dukes spent the money on dry cleaning, flowers, gifts, and donations to political campaigns.

The Internet is full of ads and scams these days offering to introduce lonely men to attractive foreign women. Take a lesson from five Dutch men who responded to newspaper personal ads by women who said

^{*} *The Washington Post*, Wednesday, November 26, 1997; Page A06. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1997-11/26/0521-112697-idx.html>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

they wanted to marry Dutch men. Their long-distance romances grew warmer, and the women began asking for money, which the men sent. Each of the men arranged to bring the women to the Netherlands to marry them. But when they went to Amsterdam's Schiphol airport to welcome their brides, they realized they had been stood up. The men noticed each other and compared stories, realizing that each of them apparently was waiting for the same woman. They were in fact all victims of one con artist who runs her scam out of Bangkok.

We know that some feminists are going to say that it's "woman-bashing" to note stories like these. But feminist books and magazines are full of stories about men behaving badly. If it's bashing to note stories like these, then feminists are far ahead of us in bashing men. Moreover, when feminists cite the crimes committed by men, that often leads them to claim some sort of moral superiority. That's not equality -- that's bigotry.

So we present stories like these in the hopes of puncturing feminism's smug balloon. We believe that men and women truly are equal -- not just in their talents and abilities, but in their capacity to do wrong. Men and women are never going to be equal so long as feminists push a sacred-cow image of women as superior.

Certainly, women have all the skills necessary to run con games. In fact, the very existence of extreme feminism proves that.²¹¹

Humor:

POW Demands Septuplet Equality

The Propaganda Organization for Women²¹² ... is calling on all people of conscience to boycott the Iowa Methodist Medical Center in Des Moines for its blatantly sexist treatment of the septuplets born there.

In calling for the boycott, POW President Colleen Hyphenated-Lastname noted that of

the seven children, four were boys and only three were girls.

"There is only one explanation for the difference in numbers. Discrimination."

"This fact is obvious if you look at all other fields that feminists have studied. If there aren't as many women working on road crews or construction sites, the only possible explanation is discrimination. The only time there is equality is when women outnumber men."

"The fact that females did not have equality in the septuplets can only mean two things. First, that men are to blame. And two, I am therefore entitled to compensation. And I will not rest until justice is done."

"Some people will claim that this ratio was simply determined by biology. Nonsense. We reject biological determinism. All differences between girls and boys are due only to socialization. Obviously someone got to these kids pretty early."

"Was it the mother? As feminists, we feel ashamed that some Stepford Wife who wants to have children could buy into all the anti-female attitudes of the patriarchy and produce septuplets in which the females are accorded second-class status. Though society has come a long way in treating women equally, it still has a long way to go. We have finally instituted hiring goals, and yet we are helpless to enforce birthing goals. If they had been in place, we would have required females to be represented equally among the septuplets, and prevented this miscarriage of justice."

"Of course, seven is an odd number, so it's difficult to make septuplets equally boys and girls. We would have settled for one of the males being named Dennis Rodman. Barring that, there are other ways to enforce quotas. If there had been six girls and one male, we would have considered that equal. Another alternative would have been an abortion to "choice" out one of the male fetuses and ensure equality for women."

"After all, affirmative action is about sacrificing innocent males for the sake of feminism. Why are we drawing the line now?"²¹³

1998

JANUARY 1998

WELCOME, READERS, to our first issue of a brand new year. Per's MANifesto prides itself in supplying you with news you can use to debunk feminism's eternal claims of victimhood and oppression, so this issue we take a look at women's health. That's while we're dubbing this issue "A FIT WITH FEMINISM."

First off, we'd like to offer you some wishes for 1998.

- We wish that no child should ever have to go without a father because of the irresponsibility of a man or the misogyny of a feminist.
- We wish that the concept that it's wrong to discriminate on the basis of gender will finally mean that it's wrong to discriminate on the basis of gender.
- We wish that sexist bigotry and hatred will no longer be acceptable merely because it comes from feminists.
- We wish that, with the family under siege and divorce and fatherless families still at a too-high rate, our society will realize that man-bashing is NOT a victimless crime.

As we look forward to the new year, we hope we can continue to do our part in helping you to fight the all-too-popular anti-male attitudes in our culture. We think some progress is being made. Recently, we did some checking that showed that Per's MANifesto Newsletter is within reach of joining the top thousand sites on the entire web. That's not bad for an independent, privately funded web site that doesn't have major corporate backing! Your loyalty and word-of-mouth are what makes it happen. And we'd like to propel MANifesto into the top thousand and better. You can help. Many readers have written in asking what they can do to help out MANifesto. Well here are some ideas:

- When periodicals have "best of the net" features that recommend favorite web sites, write and recommend MANifesto.
- Write to mainstream magazines and newspapers and mention the site.
- Write to webzines like Wired and recommend that they feature MANifesto.
- Help get it listed on more search engines.

- For those of you who read MANifesto via email subscription or the usenet, drop by the web site now and then to improve our hit count.*

Remember, you help yourself by helping to dispel the shameful, anti-male myths being pumped out today.

Okay, enough of the shameless plug -- at least until next year! Meantime, let's look at some of the myths and issues about women's health. Let's have "A FIT WITH FEMINISM."

Fitness Standards, Double Standards

The fitness standards for women in the military have long been far below that of men. There is a blatant, two-tiered system in which women are allowed to pass fitness tests with performance that would get a man booted out. The standards have been lowered so that women could meet them. And this has led to the objections from some men who are penalized for performance that actually far exceeds the performance of women.

You may have recently read about how the Army is going to "toughen" or "raise" the physical standards for women. That claim was presented in a number of news articles. It made it sound like women were going to be held to tougher standards and required to perform better on physical tests.

Well, that shows once again why you need Per's MANifesto to give you the rest of the story. In fact, the Army is merely making it a little harder for women to get perfect scores on physical tests. But the *minimum* requirements are mostly staying the same. Of course it's the *minimum* requirements that set the level at which you pass or fail. And the minimums are not changing much. Women can still qualify at the same, far-lower standards.

This fact is readily discernible just by glancing at a chart that ran in USA Today on September 26. It shows the Army's current fitness standards for men and for women, broken down by age group. It also compares them to the proposed new standards.

The Army says that it is going to require women to do an equal number of sit-ups as men. But that's the only area in which re-

* It's at: <<http://idt.net/~per2/manifest.htm>>

quirements will be even remotely similar. In some areas, women will still "pass" for performance that would cause a man to fail, and they will receive "high" scores for a performance that would be mediocre or even failing in a man.

For example:

To meet the minimum requirement for the 2-mile run, a man age 17-21 has to finish in 15 minutes, 54 seconds. To get a perfect score of 100, he has to finish in 11:54.

To meet the minimum, a woman that age has to finish in only 18:54. For a perfect score, she only has to finish in 14:54.

In other words, her "perfect" score is only one minute less than the bare *minimum* for men! The women getting elite scores are performing at a level that would barely let a man squeak by.

Now consider all the women who are in the middle of the pack, between the perfect time of 14:54 and the minimum of 18:54. They're finishing in about 16:54. But at that speed, a man wouldn't even pass the male minimum of 15:54. A middle-of-the-pack woman would *flunk* the men's test!

Fitness standards also change by age -- they get lower as you get older. Let's consider some of the blatant imbalances this sets up.

Under the current rules, a 36-year-old man has to run 2 miles in 18 minutes to meet the minimum qualification. In other words, a 36-year-old man has to run faster than a 17-year-old woman less than half his age.

But wait, it gets worse. A 41-year-old man is expected to finish in 18:42. That's right, a 41-year-old man still has to complete 2 miles faster than a 17-year-old woman!

The chart shows that a lot of the minimum times for women are staying the same. They're making it harder for women to get a perfect *top* score. But they're not actually raising *minimum* standards much. It's a sleight-of-hand. For example, there are no changes in the women's minimum times for the 2-mile run in the 17-21 age group or the 22-26 age group. And women would actually get half a minute *more* to finish in the 27-31 age group. They're actually *lowering* the standards for women.

And in some cases, they're actually *raising* the minimum standards for men.

The current standard for men age 42-46 is finishing 2 miles in 19:06. The proposed new standard makes it *tougher* for men, requiring them to finish in 18:30. Meanwhile, the female minimum in the 17-21 age group stays the same: 18:54. So the proposed new fitness standards would mean a 46-year-old man has to run 2 miles faster than a 17-year old woman. And a 51-year-old man would get precisely 18 seconds more to run 2 miles than a 17-year-old woman! Out on the training fields, there will be grandfathers who are required to possess the speed of teen-agers.

Anyone who has had to deal with affirmative action sees the game being played here. Feminists can go on saying that "no unqualified women" were hired/enlisted. It's just that the qualifications for women are so much lower. And only by rigging up double standards in favor of women can you escape the accusation of discriminating against women. If you're not discriminating in favor of women, you're a sexist.

Of course, once all the standards are biased in favor of women, then we are on the road to "equality," in the brave new world of feminism.²¹⁴

Scaring Women to Death

Do feminists really care about women's health? Or are they just trying to make women scared and paranoid, and thus easy to manipulate?

You be the judge -- consider feminism's track record on some very important health issues: weight, cigarettes, and breast cancer.

Feminists have been trying to convince us that men, being the brutes they are, have been causing women to starve themselves literally to death. That, according to feminists, is because men "objectify" women's bodies by demanding that women be slim. This, in turn, leads to anorexia among women, and that leads to a new "Holocaust" of anorexia victims, so the theory goes.

In "Revolution from Within," Gloria Steinem helped foster the myth that "about 150,000 females die of anorexia each year" in the United States alone. Naomi Wolf made the same claim in "The Beauty Myth" and compared it to the Holocaust. Ann Landers quoted the figure in a column in April 1992. It has become a staple of anti-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

male propaganda -- those horrible men with their lustful demands that women stay slim were driving hundreds of thousands of women and girls to the grave! Men were "objectifying" women's bodies, with deadly results.

Problem is, the 150,000 figure was bogus -- absurdly so. In "Who Stole Feminism," Christina Hoff Sommers showed that there were at most 150,000 to 200,000 *cases* of anorexia in the United States -- cases, not deaths. The actual number of deaths among anorectics is less than 100 each year, and these are usually the result of suicide, not from dying of anorexia itself. It was not a case of the evil patriarchy "objectifying" anorectics into a new Holocaust, despite the best efforts of leading feminists to convince us so.

But we recently heard that some feminist groups are still making the absurd 150,000-deaths claim, even after it has been soundly debunked. Apparently they never met a man-bashing smear they didn't like -- and they're not going to let truth get in the way of good propaganda.

As we noted in the May 1997 issue of Per's MANifesto, Canadian researchers say that anorexia and other eating disorders might occur more often in women because they manufacture much less of an important mood-regulating brain chemical called serotonin. And so far as we know, that's not because the patriarchy has been cutting off women's rations of serotonin. These eating disorders are most likely due to neurochemical imbalances, not from men being evil.

But while feminists are trying to convince the world that thinness is causing a new Holocaust among women, the leading cause of death among women is still directly related to weighing too much, not too little.

The leading cause of death among women is still heart disease, and it has been for a long time. Here are the major risk factors and contributing risk factors for heart disease, according to The American Heart Association,* Major Risk Factors;

- Cigarette/Tobacco Smoke
- Blood Cholesterol
- High Blood Pressure

- Physical Inactivity
- Heredity as a Risk Factor

Contributing Risk Factors;†

- Diabetes Mellitus
- Obesity

These factors all put extra strain on the heart. Note that obesity is a contributing factor. Women (and men) are more likely to die of heart disease if they are overweight. It's weighing too much that is killing women -- not weighing too little.

And as for feminism's notion that men are causing women to starve themselves into thinness, the fact is that a higher percentage of women than men are overweight. The American Heart Association (as cited in The World Almanac and Book of Facts, 1996) gives the percentage of men and women who are 20 percent overweight:

32 percent of white males.
33.5 percent of white females.
31.5 percent of black males.
49.6 percent of black females.

So, despite feminism's best efforts to paint an image of men starving hordes of women into submission, more women than men are overweight. If feminism was truly concerned with women's health, it would address obesity rather than bashing men with bogus statistics about anorexia.

As you'll note in the figures above, cigarette smoking also is a major contributor to heart disease. Why are feminists so vocal about anorexia and not cigarettes? Well, one reason is that for years, major feminist organizations accepted large sums of money from tobacco companies. You can call this money "contributions," if you wish. We call it hush money. Tobacco companies saw women as an underdeveloped market. So cigarette brands like Virginia Slims tried to appeal to women's sense of liberation and emancipation with slogans like "You've come a long way, baby." Virginia Slims even came out with a notorious series of man-bashing advertisements designed to paint men as chauvinist pigs and appeal to

* See: <<http://www.amhrt.org/newhome.html>>

† See: <http://www.amhrt.org/Heart/Risk_FactorsH/Major/index.html>

feminism's sense of victimhood. Virginia Slims sponsored women's sporting events, including a tennis tournament, and continued giving money to feminist organizations.

The result: feminists have raised all sorts of Cain about crackpot theories like the anorexia "Holocaust," but they've been remarkably silent about the effects of smoking and lung cancer on women's health.

Feminism did seize on one cancer issue, though: breast cancer. Because breast cancer occurs almost exclusively in women, this gave feminists an excellent wedge issue. They could whip up all sorts of anxiety and resentment and claim that women's health was somehow being shortchanged or overlooked.

These campaigns have worked. Think of all the pink ribbons you've seen, all the nightly-news reports and magazine articles. Feminists have focused on breast cancer so much that most women have an entirely distorted idea of the conditions that truly threaten their health.

Recently, a group called The National Council on the Aging did a study asking women what disease they fear most. They found that 61 percent said cancer, while only 9 percent said heart attack. They also found that women believe breast cancer kills more women than lung cancer or heart disease. But heart disease *is* the leading cause of death among women, and more women die of lung cancer than of breast cancer. The emphasis on breast cancer has caused women to be misinformed about the most threatening dangers to their health.*

So do feminists truly care about women's health, or are they just trying to make women scared and paranoid, and thus easy to manipulate?

We'll believe feminists have women's best interests at heart when they stop the man-bashing and start addressing the real causes of women's illnesses.²¹⁵

Chauvinist Pigs, Guinea Pigs

Maybe you've heard feminists gripe about how women were often excluded from med-

ical studies involving experimental drugs. It was another example of a male-dominated field ignoring and harming women, they say.

Actually, women were often excluded from such tests for three reasons. First, men do not have monthly changes in hormonal cycles. When you're testing drugs, you must eliminate all possible variables so that you know that any difference you detect can be pinned to one cause and only one cause. Changes in hormonal cycles muddled the waters by making researchers unsure if the changes they were detecting were due solely to the drugs they were testing, or whether it might have been a combination of factors including hormonal changes. The easiest way to eliminate those possible variables was to test drugs on subjects who do not have menstrual periods -- namely, men.

Secondly, there was concern that an experimental drug might be given to a woman who was pregnant but did not know it yet. Scientists were concerned about the potential effects on the developing fetus. The thalidomide catastrophe showed how even a seemingly innocuous drug could lead to horrible birth deformities if taken while pregnant. The way to get around this problem was to test drugs on people who don't get pregnant -- namely, men.

And thirdly, there was the element of risk in any study involving experimental drugs. They could harm the subject in unforeseen ways. The solution to this was to test drugs only on people society deemed expendable -- namely, men.

But feminists have a genius for seizing on any difference in society's treatment of men and women and then declaring that women are the victims. It doesn't matter if men were being treated like human laboratory rats -- and suffering the consequences if the tests went wrong. It was women who were the victims, feminists said.

Feminists demanded more medical tests on women. One result is the massive, expensive, U.S.-government funded study on estrogen. The \$628 million government-financed Women's Health Initiative aims to study whether taking estrogen or other hormones after menopause causes breast cancer or prevents heart attacks and broken bones.

So finally feminists have a study in which women and only women can serve as the

* "Myth and Misperceptions About Aging and Women's Health," a study by The National Council on the Aging. The report is available online through the "Press Room" section of their web site at: <<http://scooby.mrl.nyu.edu:8000/index.htm>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

guinea pigs. At last feminists have the chance to show all those brave women stepping forward to put their bodies on the line for the good of all.

And guess what? The study is in danger of flopping because not enough women are volunteering.

Hmm. The patriarchy must have gotten to them somehow.

The Women's Health Initiative needs 164,500 volunteers nationwide. But it's about 47,000 short.

Researchers say that what's keeping women away is that they're concerned about the risks. "Many women are afraid of complications from the hormones," according to an Associated Press story by Jon Marcus.

Of course, risk is what all experimental drug tests are about. And in this case, the subjects aren't even taking some exotic, bizarre concoction from the corporate laboratory, but the same type of hormones their bodies have already produced.

Now, because volunteerism is so low, this puts an additional expense on taxpayers, who now have to fund a huge mass-mailing that's aimed at flushing out a few more stalwarts to volunteer for the test.

Feminists have been complaining for a very long time that women were supposedly shut out of such tests.* We wonder what their excuse is now that women are the only ones allowed.²¹⁶

Happy Tubby Me?

Speaking of feminist weight issues, let's talk about one of the most sinister plots ever unleashed on females. Let's talk about the unwholesome embodiment of all that is evil, a festering blight that feeds up the greed, vanity, lust, and avarice lurking in the dark corners of the human soul.

Let's talk about Barbie.

You know how this plastic doll keeps getting under feminists skin. They can't stand Barbie's rather unrealistic proportions, her perpetual slimness, and her refusal to hold water even when dunked in a bathtub. If Barbie were a real woman, they said, her measurements would be 38-18-34. Feminists say this sets unrealistic goals for girls, caus-

ing low self esteem, eating disorders, and abductions aboard flying saucers.

Okay, we made up that flying saucer part. But feminists made up the rest, and have been pushing that argument for years. They see Barbie as part of the war on women, inflicted by a society (that is, men) who are objectifying women.

So feminists were delighted back in 1991 when a Minneapolis company called High Self-Esteem Toys (we're not kidding) started selling Happy, the Happy To Be Me doll. Happy's measurements were a more realistic if un-Baywatchian 36-27-38, and her feet were flat -- ready for sensible shoes and Birkenstocks, in contrast to Barbie's permanently arch feet made only for high heels. The box that some Happys came in declared that "She looks and moves like a real person."[†]

Feminists thought this will cure all sorts of self-esteem problems for little girls. One feminist has an "empowerment" web page cluttered with all sorts of feminist nostrums, including this plug for Happy: "Great to give personally as a gift to daughter, granddaughter, niece or family friend. Shows the child you support this image and creates self-esteem."[‡]

But we could have guessed Happy's fate. For one thing, it's not very smart to give a doll a name that sounds like "Happy Tubby Me." But we could also learn a lot by looking at the "action figures" sold to boys -- the plastic figures depicting cartoon characters, superheroes, Kung-Fu fighters and other macho characters. Barbie's figure might be unrealistic, but boys' "action figures" have a musculature that even a steady intravenous drip of steroids couldn't create. These figures are selling fantasy -- whether it's Barbie selling it to girls, or He-Man selling it to boys. And no one has claimed that boys' self-esteem is harmed by the unrealistic expectations raised by G.I. Joe. Or if those figures do create high expectations, we expect boys to cope with it.

Of course someone could always come out with a boys' equivalent of a Happy To Be Me figure -- an action figure with a "reason-

[†] You can see a picture of Happy at

<<http://www.seanet.com/HTML/Users/matts/happy2be.htm>>, but the page takes quite a long time to load.

[‡] See: <<http://oscar.ctc.edu/~jhalsan/Empowerment.html>>

* Note: if you wish to volunteer, you can call 1-800-54-WOMEN.

able" physique, and maybe even a kung-fu grip that operates a little TV remote control (sold separately).

But we suspect that Couch Potato Joe wouldn't sell very well.

Meanwhile, for all you feminists who want to improve girls' self esteem by buying a Happy doll, we have two words for you:

Yard sale.

That's about the only place you're going to find one. Despite reams of free publicity, fanfare, and feminist support, the Happy figure has gone out of business.

Little girls didn't want it.*

Barbie, however, is still going strong.²¹⁷

Her Body, Her Selfishness

Feminists have long claimed that they have the best interest of children at heart. So it's interesting how often feminists come rushing to the defense of a woman who has thrown her newborn into a garbage can or taken drugs while pregnant.

Feminists say that it's none of our business if a woman takes drugs while pregnant. It's her body, it's her choice, they say.

Except that her behavior has serious consequences, both for the child who is harmed by her action and for the society where such damaged children grow up to be troubled adults.

With that in mind, we'd like to note the case of a Wisconsin woman who was forced into custody two years ago because she was using cocaine while pregnant. The newspapers are not naming the woman -- supposedly to protect the identity of the child she later bore -- but we believe we remember this case. In particular, we remember the feminists who declared that putting this woman into custody to protect her unborn child was a horrible act of oppression. It was a violation of her rights. It would be far better, they seemed to think, that the woman should be free to go on using cocaine while pregnant than to put her into temporary custody -- far better that her innocent child should be locked forever into a prison caused by birth defects than that this woman should be locked up temporarily for violating our drug laws.

We advocate compassionate treatment for such women, including free drug treatment and counseling. We also advocate compassionate treatment for her unborn child, including the right to be free of birth defects.

We remember this case because this woman is in the news again.

She was just arrested in Waukesha, Wisconsin, for possessing drug paraphernalia commonly used for smoking cocaine.

And she is pregnant again.²¹⁸

More Battered Logic Defense

More and more, the so-called "battered women's defense" is being shown up as an effort to give violent or lawbreaking people a "get out of jail free" card.

The latest fiasco involves Shannon Booker, who had won praise and support as one of the "Framingham Eight." They were eight women in a Massachusetts prison who wanted to get out of jail by using the "battered-woman defense."

The defense consists of claiming that women are innocent when they kill because abuse has rendered them no longer responsible for their own actions. Proving the "abuse" is often an iffy thing. Of course the person who might offer some contradicting testimony -- the men they've killed -- are no longer alive and no longer able to defend their names or offer their version of events.

The "battered women's defense" has made gains in the justice system because it is pushed by a great many feminists who don't seem to think that killing a man is all that great of an offense. And it's been supported by all sorts of politicians and legal figures who think that being voted out of a job by feminists WOULD be a great offense.

Shannon Booker is one of the killers for whom the "battered woman's defense" worked. She was convicted of manslaughter in 1989 for killing her boyfriend, but she got out on parole in only five years when then-Governor William F. Weld bowed to pressure and ordered a review of her case based on her "battered woman's defense."

So what's she been up to?

Well, she's been twice accused on theft charges. Once she got off with a warning -- even though she was on parole!

But a second case involving the theft of a stranger's wallet resulted in her landing back

* See: <<http://www.barbie.com/>>

<<http://www.fau.edu/library/barblink.htm>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

in Framingham Prison with parole revoked. A trial is set for Jan. 28.

So what's Shannon Booker going to claim this time?

Well, if the "battered woman's defense" worked last time, why not give it another shot?

That's right. Shannon Booker is now claiming that she stole a wallet because a boyfriend made her do it. It's his fault, she says. She's the real victim.

Ms. Booker says she met a fellow at a support group for substance abusers, and that he abused her and forced her into the theft.

That's interesting, because when Ms. Booker was trying to get out of prison the first time, one of the accomplishments cited in her favor was that she was great at counseling women on how to recognize and avoid abusive relationships.

Now her lawyer, Bernard Akram, has filed a motion to dismiss the case, arguing that Ms. Booker suffers once again from "battered women's syndrome" because she had fallen into an "abusive" relationship. The motion claims that the man drove her to a store and ordered her to go in and come out with money. In the legalistic psychobabble common to these arguments, the motion claims that "The defendant reasonably believed that there was no escape from serious injury except through compliance with the demands of her batterer."

No escape? How about the back door? How about alerting the store's security? How about telling a clerk or phoning the police?

One of the most amazing things about "battered women's syndrome" is that the women who claim it seem remarkably "escape impaired," deciding that the best and only solution is to kill somebody -- or, in this case, to steal a stranger's wallet.

As far as legal authorities know, this is the first time that a woman has claimed she stole a wallet from a person she never met because of "battered women's syndrome." But with a little lack of shame and an attitude that there's nothing to lose, this defense could probably be used to evade responsibility for just about anything. Lady Macbeth? Classic case of battered women's syndrome.

And what of the rest of the "Framingham Eight," the men-killing women who said it

was the men who made them violent? Seven, including Booker, were released. Booker, as you know, is back in prison. And another, Patricia Allen, was back in prison in July. The charge? Assault with a deadly weapon.

Hmm. If the boyfriend is already dead, we wonder how he made her do that?²¹⁹

Feminists are Not Your Allies

Recently we encountered a familiar situation -- seeing a man ardently defend a supposedly "moderate" feminist. The man wanted the "moderate" feminist to be treated with kid gloves. He wanted to encourage every little baby step the feminist might take toward recognizing that men in general are not the hellspawn of Satan and so on.

Fellows like this seem to be under the impression that by not challenging the feminist's worst anti-male beliefs, they were somehow being nice guys. This, they seemed to think, would in turn encourage the feminist to see men as swell fellows and not evil patriarchs.

We doubt it.

If you let someone treat you like a doormat, the primary lesson that person learns is that you don't mind being treated like a doormat.

And if you hold your tongue while "moderate" feminists trot out the same old anti-male stereotypes and disinformation, the moderate feminists will learn that it is acceptable to bash men. And that nice guys let them do it.

We don't think that being a nice guy means you have to go along with the demonization of the male half of the human race.

And we don't think that feminists will evolve out of their anti-male bigotry if all we do is give them a safe and nurturing environment for them to spread their anti-male bigotry.

We try to understand where men like that are coming from. Maybe they are just so shell-shocked over today's ubiquitous man-bashing that when they see a "moderate" feminist, they are so grateful and relieved they can hardly speak.

But scratch the surface of any "moderate" feminist's views and you're bound to find anti-male beliefs -- disinformation about the "glass ceiling," anorexia, the "patriarchy," domestic violence, the "rule of thumb," and

other myths fostered by anti-male propagandists. In addition, many "moderate" feminists support affirmative action and other forms of anti-male discrimination. We don't think anyone bigoted enough to advocate discrimination is a "moderate." And if she's targeting us for her discriminatory exercises in "equality," she's no better than any Jim Crow yahoo. That's not moderateness. That's bigotry.

So we urge all men and women to stop thinking they can coddle a "moderate" feminist out of her anti-male attitudes. Attitudes like that never go away until society *demands* that they go away. You don't have to get ugly about it. But you do have to get firm.

And please drop the idea that feminists can somehow become your allies if you're simply nice enough to them. Feminists are not your allies. Even if you make them realize that *you* are a human being, they still view the world through a warped gender prism that affects the policies they advocate and the propaganda they spread. Even if you get a feminist to think that *you* are a nice guy, they'll still cling to stereotypes about the patriarchy, still preach about their victimhood, and they'll still advocate solutions and opinions that are decidedly anti-male.

For example: We recently read some comments from a supposed moderate feminist who said: "I care about equal rights, but in my view women still have fewer rights than men, so I care about theirs somewhat more. While many women are still being literally bashed by abusive partners, I find it hard to get too worked up about some figurative male-bashing ..."

So to unpack her statements: "I care about equal rights, but I hold my rights equaler." This feminist could not, of course, name one single right that men have that women do not have. Women have all the same guaranteed rights as men, plus such de facto rights as the greater right to child custody, greater protection from harassment, longer lifespans, and so on. Her claim that she cared about equal rights was blatantly transparent. She was far more interested in her rights than in equal rights. If men have that attitude, they're called sexists.

Then there's the next part of her statement: "While many women are still being literally

bashed by abusive partners, I find it hard to get too worked up about some figurative male-bashing ..." A feminist like this will *always* find some reason not to object to anti-male hatred. There will always be an unfortunate woman in Kuala Lumpur or Vladivostok whose plight demands immediate sisterly solidarity. A feminist like this will always claim to oppose anti-male hatred and anti-male violence -- and she'll never run out of excuses for condoning or ignoring them when they happen. What if you said to a feminist like this one: "While many men are still dying in on-the-job accidents, I find it hard to get too worked up over sexual harassment or the alleged 'glass ceiling.' "? You can bet that feminist would excoriate you for not caring enough about the plight of women.

Or you could point to the objective studies showing that women commit a huge amount of the domestic violence and child abuse that goes on today. And you could say "With so many victims of violence by women, I find it hard to get worked up over violence against women." You can bet she wouldn't accept that.

She will never grasp the concept that the best way to embrace equal rights is to embrace *equal* rights. There will always be a reason why it's more important to protect the rights and safety of her group -- even at the expense of yours.²²⁰

Trucker Fired for Saving Lives

What's a man's life worth these days?

Evidently less than a load of merchandize.

On January 3rd, trucker Rick Bloom was coming out of a tunnel on rain-slicked Interstate 5 south of Palmdale, California, when he suddenly saw a tangled wreck up ahead. There were fourteen other tractor-trailers piled up in a massive wreck.

In one of those trucks was John Hunt, whose rig had already been hit by two other trucks. When he saw Bloom's rig bearing down on him, "I'm thinking, 'We're dead.' "

With only seconds to react, Bloom deliberately jackknifed his own truck. It brought him to a stop before the plowed into Hunt or any of the other wrecks. California Highway Patrol officers said Bloom prevented a head-on crash.

Bloom was hailed as a hero.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Then he was fired.

His supervisor at Conway Truck Loading Services called him up and told him he was being sacked for damaging the load he was hauling. "They never asked me what happened. They called me at 7:30 in the morning and told me I was fired for failing to maintain control."

"He was terminated because he failed to control his vehicle," Howard Jasper, Bloom's supervisor, told the Daily News of Los Angeles. Conway is headquartered in Fort Worth, Texas.

Bloom says "I would still do the same thing because both myself and Hunt would probably have been killed if I didn't jack-knife the trailer."²²¹

Gloria Allred Jokes

Didja hear that feminist lawyer Gloria Allred is suing to have seatbelts removed from cars?

She heard that they hold women back.

Oh, and didja hear that Ms. Allred is suing the people who put up telephone poles?

Yeah, she heard they use guy wires.²²²

MARCH 1998

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue devoted to examining "SEXUAL POLITICS AS USUAL." The scandals involving the White House are different primarily in scale and the amount of publicity. But really they're not that much different from run-of-the-mill accusations tossed about in the hinterlands. They all involve unprovable he-said/she-said accusations, they all reek of ulterior motives, and feminists always chose sides based on the best payoff for them. So let's take a look at SEXUAL POLITICS AS USUAL.

Sexual politics as Usual

All across the United States there has been an amazing blossoming of the ability to read minds.

The sex scandals in Washington have revealed the enormous numbers of Americans who are clairvoyant. Tell them the latest sexual-harassment accusations and they instantly know which accusations are true and which are false.

There's something remarkable about this new form of ESP. People seem to know that accusations against a politician they like are false, and that accusations against a politician they dislike are true. And this form of ESP seems to be working equally well on the left and right, and among supports and detractors of Bill Clinton.

At Per's MANifesto, we wish we had these supernatural powers of deduction. Alas, we don't, so all we can do is slip back into that cursed old white-European-patriarchal-male mode of looking at the evidence.

We prefer the White House log, for instance, that shows that Monica Lewinsky returned to the White House 37 times when she was no longer employed there -- for reasons yet to be satisfactorily explained. Last issue, we followed the trail showing an awful lot of perks going to people who might have damaging information about the president. If there's evidence that people are being paid off to keep their mouths shut, it's evidence that there is something to keep their mouths shut about.

If we doubted the president's word in the last issue, let's give him the benefit of the doubt in this one. Sexual harassment accusations almost always involve unprovable statements and he-said/she-said disputes. This one is no different. There has been much posturing and hanky panky on both sides.

Consider the latest development in the Paula Jones case. Lawyers for Ms. Jones are now saying that her alleged harassment by the president so traumatized her that she has developed an aversion to sex. They have an affidavit from a sexual disorders specialist who examined Jones on Feb. 13 and said she has a form of "post-traumatic stress disorder."

Jones has never made such a claim in the seven years since her encounter with Clinton. (Her lawyers say that this claim has always been lurking in the background as part of the emotional distress supposedly inflicted on her.)

It should always set off alarm bells whenever an accuser begins escalating her story long after the fact. We've seen this pattern before in child custody disputes and bitter divorces. First a woman makes an initial accusation. This accusation doesn't hurt the

man enough, so next she "remembers" new traumas or develops new symptoms. Her story keeps changing: the initial episode she accuses him of keeps getting worse and worse, or maybe she keeps remembering other, more severe incidents she somehow failed to mention the first time around. Her story keeps escalating until either the man is crushed or the woman loses all credibility.

We've always said that such an escalation of accusations is a warning flag of possible deceit. We're not going to make an exception for Jones now, no matter what we feel about Clinton.

We can't help noting that Jones' claim of sexual aversion comes while the Clinton camp is mounting its main defense: namely, that even if the encounter between Jones and Clinton happened the way she describes it, her lawsuit should still be thrown out on the grounds that she hasn't suffered any harm. Jones is counteracting with some rather new assertions of harm.

Clinton's defense strategy is worth noting. He is saying that a man can proposition a woman, even crudely, and she is still not permanently damaged because of it. (What a revelation.)

That's pretty different from the stance feminists took during the Clarence Thomas and Bob Packwood scandals. Feminists seemed to think that any sexual hanky panky deserved immediate and severe punishment. They didn't seem to need to prove that a woman was harmed. If the comment or action offended feminists, the man had to be booted out. After Bob Packwood was accused of kissing and propositioning women, do you remember feminists saying "Oh, she didn't suffer any lasting damage"? We don't remember that, either. The standards have changed in direct relation to the politics involved.

But recent developments again underscore just how political all sexual harassment allegations are. Clinton's lawyer, Robert Bennett, recently threatened to dredge up Paula Jones' sex life to counter her claim of "sexual aversion." He said he was going to submit to the court a sealed document with evidence to disprove that Jones has an aversion to sex. That's a thinly veiled threat to expose her sexual activities.

Bennett withdrew this threat after feminist groups reacted angrily. Clinton's camp decided it could not risk alienating a core constituency. And that shows just how political the entire process is. Matters of evidence are based on political considerations, not on how relevant they are. You do what you can get away with.

This isn't the first time Bennett threatened to use Jones' sexual history against her. He made a similar move last year, then scuttled it because of similar outrage by feminists.

Jones' side is making an interesting point about this. The Violence Against Women Act generally bars the use of a woman's sexual history against her when she claims she was harassed or abused. Clinton signed that law, and is willing to violate it to save his own skin.

Laws, after all, are for little people.

And few things in this case are more political than the actions of White House communications director Ann Lewis, the strongest defender Clinton has. Yes, she's the same Ann Lewis who came out so stridently on the side of Anita Hill. Now she's attacking the credibility of Kathleen Willey, the former White House aide who accused Clinton of groping her and placing her hand on his crotch.

Lewis is another one of those people who instantly know which accusations are true or false. Back in 1991, she instantly knew Anita Hill's accusations were true. Now she instantly knows Willey's are false. In this, she is like an awful lot of Americans -- except that her beliefs happen to take the side of the person who signs her paycheck.

Lewis has been very active in pointing out that Willey kept up a cordial correspondence with Clinton after the alleged harassment incident. Lewis says these continued contacts with Clinton create doubt about Willey's honesty. Why would she stay in contact with him if he had really treated her so badly?

But the same questions were raised about Anita Hill and her continued contact with Clarence Thomas. Lewis had no trouble believing that Hill was more or less forced to stay on Thomas' good side. Back in 1991, she said: "You don't know what it's like to be a young working woman, to have this really prestigious and powerful boss you think you

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

have to stay on the right side of him for the rest of your working life or he could nix another job. ... If you have trouble listening to women's voices, please listen to what I said again. I said she was trying to stay on his right side because her economic career would be at stake."

Well, Ms. Lewis, you seem to have trouble listening to Kathleen Willey's voice. We'd ask you to read your own words again, but we know the outcome -- the same old double-standards feminism has been practicing for decades. Feminists object to discrimination against them but demand discrimination against men. Feminists condemn the stereotyping of women but promote virulent stereotypes of men. Feminists demand that they be allowed to enter male-only academies, then set up scores of women-only schools. The type of feminist hypocrisy Ms. Lewis is practicing is neither new nor rare.

As for Willey herself, there are questions emerging about her version of events, as well. A friend, Julie Hiatt Steele, released an affidavit saying Willey asked her to lie to a Newsweek reporter about the sequence of events in Willey's encounter with Clinton. Willey says Steele is a tool of the White House.

And so it goes.

As for Clinton, he's probably the one person most obviously caught lying. For years he has been repeatedly and strongly denying that he had an affair with Gennifer Flowers. Remember his long-faced, injured-innocence look on "60 Minutes" in 1991? But in a deposition he had to give Jan. 17 in the Paula Jones case, Clinton finally admitted under oath, after years of claiming otherwise, that he and Flowers had sex in 1977. He says it happened only once.

And if he had a cigarette after that sex, we suppose he didn't inhale.

The Clinton scandal is taking place on the highest levels of government, but it has a lot in common with sexual harassment allegations everywhere. That's because they are all essentially "political," even if it's office politics or the politics of dating. If a woman likes a man, then it's not an offense. If she doesn't like him, he should be fired, perhaps even jailed. The whole area is subjective. The Clinton scandal merely has a bigger audience, with larger groups of feminists

cynically weighing the drawbacks and pay-offs of supporting the accusations against him.

The recent case at Miller Brewing Company was rife with politics. A woman got a man fired because he pointed to the word "clitoris" on the page of a dictionary. When the man sued, the jury agreed with him that he was fired primarily because of office politics.

So we will leave the clairvoyance on the White House scandals to those who seem to possess that sort of ESP. As for us, there is one overwhelmingly important message coming out of this scandal: when you are accused, fight back.

Bob Packwood didn't fight back. He threw himself on the mercy of feminists, which is a lot like the Titanic throwing itself on the mercy of the iceberg. Packwood confessed to having a drinking problem that might have contributed to his behavior, but if he expected mercy from feminists, he was sorely mistaken. Feminists, who have florid self-pity for their own problems, are notably without mercy when attacking men. Some men they've driven to suicide.

Packwood made some clumsy, halfhearted moves to defend himself. His representatives were going to question the accusers about their motives and their credibility. But feminists put up a storm of protest. How dare a man seek due process? How dare a man defend himself? So Packwood dropped his defenses and played nice.

He was quickly out of office.

Bill Clinton, for all his faults, shows the importance of fighting for yourself. Feminists would like men to be so overwhelmed with guilt, and so unsure about defending themselves, that men are ripe for picking off. Clinton has shown that you can fight back -- in fact, it's your only option. They will try to break you, if you let them.

Moreover, the Clinton case has done a lot to clarify what approach to take. Feminists are going to have a harder time saying that consensual sex is harassment. They're going to have a harder time demanding that we believe every accusation they make after they long ignored the accusations of half a dozen women. Feminists are going to have a harder time whipping up emotional responses to harassment accusations after they were

so detached and passive in the Clinton case. They'll have a tougher time convincing us that alleged sexual harassment is so traumatic it deserves immediate punishment, when Clinton himself is arguing that the women suffered no real harm. Moreover, feminists are going to have to contend with men who have been given an example on a national level that it's all right to defend yourself.

If Clinton is guilty of other things -- obstruction of justice, suborning perjury -- that's a different matter. But like him or not, he has shown the nation that a man can fight back.²²³

Per's Rule of Feminist Support

Nowhere has "sexual politics as usual" been more apparent than in the continuing saga of America's Kennedy family.

Though the term "patriarchy" usually comes out of feminists' mouths sounding like an obscenity, feminists have always admired and supported this patriarchal family. As they are doing now with Bill Clinton, feminists always tried very hard to look the other way and pretend they didn't see the evidence when someone they liked was accused of mistreating women. In the Kennedy family, that trait goes back to patriarch Joe Kennedy, a notorious womanizer. "Sunset Boulevard" star Gloria Swanson claimed he raped her, but the sun never set on the appeal of the Kennedys, as far as many feminists are concerned.

There's no need to go into all the legends about Jack Kennedy's womanizing. And the shenanigans of his young brother Ted are also legendary.

More important, feminists stood by Ted Kennedy even after Mary Jo Kopechne died in his car at Chappaquiddick Island. Kennedy, who has found guilty of leaving the scene of an accident, seemed more concerned about his political career than the life of a woman. But while feminists were livid that Clarence Thomas supposedly mentioned a pubic hair on a Coke can, they were astoundingly forgiving toward the man who left Mary Jo Kopechne at Chappaquiddick. Remember Per's Rule of Feminist Support: As long as you treat feminist well, it doesn't matter how you treat women.

Ted Kennedy has managed to turn this sordid episode around, so that he is virtually

seen as a victim and mentioning his actions is considered an affront. Victimhood knows no bounds.

There are other episodes in the history of the Kennedys that probably aren't as well known. There have been tales of wild drinking, dangerous stunts, drug use.

Consider U.S. Representative Joseph P. Kennedy II, eldest son of Robert and Ethel Kennedy. On Aug. 13, 1973, he rolled a sport utility vehicle on Cape Cod in an accident that left a female passenger paralyzed.

In 1979 he married a woman named Sheila Rauch. They had twin sons. He was elected to Congress in 1986. In 1991, he divorced Sheila and married an aide.

But then he tried to have his first marriage annulled.

This is a curious process in which the Catholic Church essentially considers that the first marriage never took place. So even though a woman slept in his bed for 12 years and bore him two sons, she would be treated as if she were just an illicit mistress. Joseph Kennedy had wanted to relegate his wife to a traditional gender role of supportive and submissive wife. But instead of honoring her for that role, he then wanted to treat her as if she had never been his wife. And he wanted to take for granted the support of feminists while doing this.

Sheila Rauch decided not to take the Kennedy treatment anymore. She wrote a book, "Shattered Faith," saying that Joseph Kennedy verbally abused her and tried to bully her into a divorce.

In an interview with "Primetime Live" on the U.S. network ABC, she said: "Joe would tell me that I was a nobody. ... Essentially that nobody liked me." By the end of the marriage, she "had simply become afraid of him."

This is the man who, by the way, boasts on his official U.S. House webpage biography of his programs to protect women.

Along the way there have been other scandals. William Kennedy Smith was accused and acquitted of rape -- and rightly acquitted, as far as we're concerned. But we note how many feminists were screaming for his conviction. That was a remarkable turnabout for them -- seeking punishment for a Kennedy. Why did they do it? Well, it's worth noting that William Kennedy Smith

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

planned to be a doctor, not a politician. He had not been shoveling money into feminist causes. That brings up Per's Rule of Feminist Belief: Your belief in the accusations against a man are directly related to how much use he can be to you.

Meanwhile, it looked like Joseph Kennedy would have a good shot at running for governor of Massachusetts. Then the news broke that his younger brother, Michael Kennedy, was accused of having a five-year affair with a girl who baby-sat his children, beginning when she was 14. For an adult to have sex with someone that age constitutes statutory rape. Nevertheless, the district attorney dropped the investigation because the young woman would not cooperate with investigators. Draw your own conclusions on why a woman would not testify against the wealthy and powerful Kennedy clan.

But the cumulative effect of Kennedy scandals began taking its toll. Feminists could only overlook so much, could only turn a blind eye for so long.

With his popularity waning, Joseph Kennedy has said he's folding up his political tent: he will not run for governor and not seek re-election to the House: he's retiring from politics.

After his announcement, another shoe dropped. It was reported that a nonprofit corporation Joseph Kennedy formed to help poor people afford to heat their homes has turned into a really profitable moneymaker for those on the inside. Citizens Energy Corp. has made millions of dollars for friends and insiders, the Wall Street Journal says. For example, William E. James, the group's president for several years, is in a position to reap \$18.7 million on shares he bought from the organization and resold just a year later, for 38 times what he paid. The group has devoted \$30 million to helping the poor in the past decade, but the employees have pocketed more than that for themselves.

Nothing like helping the poor to line your own pockets.

That wraps up our greatly abridged tour of Kennedy scandals -- on how a group of men who were so often suspected of using or abusing women could maintain the support of so many feminists for so long. Do feminists really care what happens to women? Or

are they willing to overlook the mistreatment of women so long as feminism gets its palm greased? (A few issues ago, MANifesto discussed the feminists who kept quiet about the scourge of lung cancer among women while receiving huge sums donated by tobacco companies. So this type of behavior is not new.)

But here's a footnote. On July 19, Matthew Kennedy, son of Joseph Kennedy, suffered minor burns from fireworks at the family compound on Cape Cod. However, fireworks are illegal in Massachusetts.

That is, they are illegal in Massachusetts if your name is not Kennedy. The state fire marshal declared, for some reason, that he would not pursue criminal charges.

So, do you know the theme song for Barney the Dinosaur? Then let's all sing:

"They'd charge you."

"They'd charge me."

"They won't charge a Ken-ne-dy..."²²⁴

Are Men More Responsible than Women?

Are men more responsible than women?

Ask a feminist that question and you're likely to get a lecture on sexism, if not a contusion. She will tell you that it's sexist to assume that men adhere to higher standards of responsibility.

That is, until the topic turns to crime.

Then most feminists will flip flop -- men are indeed far more responsible. Feminists have two core beliefs on this issue:

If men and women are involved in a crime together, the men are the most responsible parties, and the women were probably forced into it by the men.

If a woman commits a crime on her own, she is not responsible for her actions -- she's sick, distraught, oppressed, etc.

Feminists want you to believe that women take an equal part in every human endeavor in the world *except* crime, and that the only truly evil crimes are those committed by men.

* ABC "PrimeTime" transcript at http://archive.abcnews.com/onair/ptl/html_files/transcripts/ptl0423c.html; You can read a review of "Shattered Faith" on the Jam Books web site. But a word of caution: the Jam review makes it sound as if only men seek annulments and only women suffer, which is not true. See: http://www2.canoe.ca/JamBooksReviews/may18_faith.html; Rep. Joseph Kennedy's bio page: <http://www.house.gov/josephkennedy/bio.htm>

Sadly enough, there seem to be plenty of people around the world who agree.

Consider India, which is undergoing a death-penalty debate similar to the controversy in the United States over the execution of Karla Faye Tucker in February.

India is the second-most populous nation in the world, behind only China, with more than 903,000,000 people as of the 1993 census. And capital punishment is common in India.

So, with a nation with such an enormous population, how many of the people put to death would you guess were women? A hundred? A thousand?

Try zero.

Since independence, India has never executed a woman. Not one. While the death penalty is common, it is another men-only punishment. It's part of that male privilege and that superior position that men enjoy the world over.

India had sentenced a woman, Ram Shree, to be hanged along with her father and brother on April 6 in Mathura, in Uttar Pradesh state. They had killed four relatives in a family dispute in 1989.

However, its Supreme Court temporarily halted the execution -- of the woman.

Ram Shree is pleading that she can't be executed because she is a mother. She has three children -- all born while she was in prison -- and she says they need her. It sounds to us like she's cynically using these children as tools in an attempt to save her own skin.

What child ever needs a parent who is a cold-blooded killer? It is absurd to assume that Ram Shree would be a good role model for any child. Moreover, when was the last time a man's life was spared on the grounds that he was a father?

An activist group, the National Commission for Women, has also filed an appeal against the execution. We wonder -- if the only people being executed in India are men, where was the National Commission for Women during those executions? Was it protesting this sexist discrimination? Did it get involved only when it seemed like a woman might get equal treatment?

The worldwide protests over the execution of Karla Faye Tucker were not an aberration. Society holds men far more accountable for

their actions and has trouble applying the same responsibility to women.

That is borne out by another case in Montgomery County, Maryland.

Alba Ingrid Scarpelli regularly tied up and tortured 5-year-old Richard Holmes. He is the son of her live-in boyfriend, Alan Lee Holmes.

Scarpelli, 32, kept the boy tied to a bedpost with a cat leash. Sometimes she taped his mouth shut. At other times, she force-fed him hot peppers that have caused permanent damage to his liver. He cannot run or jump like other children because of damage to his ankles from being tied up.

Scarpelli was convicted of six charges, including first-degree assault, child abuse and false imprisonment. Under state sentencing guidelines, she faced a jail term of 15 to 25 years.

Holmes, by contrast, pleaded guilty to two counts: child abuse and conspiracy to commit child abuse. He faced a maximum of 15 years.

Here is what the judge decided.

The woman was sentenced to 18 months.

The man was sentenced to 8 years.

As Scarpelli's sentence was read in court, her sister Elaine Scarpelli shouted "Ingrid, that's a great sentence!"

Indeed.

Presiding over both cases was Montgomery County Circuit Court Judge DeLawrence Beard. He gave Scarpelli the slap-on-the-wrist sentence and the stiffer sentence to Holmes. Beard told Holmes he had a "higher duty" to protect his son. "You are going to receive a substantially more severe sentence because you were substantially more culpable," said Beard. "You were in a superior position to intervene and stop this."

We agree that Holmes had a duty to protect his son. We agree he ought to be punished. But the case raises troubling questions. Why is a man's duty to prevent crimes higher than a woman's duty not to commit them? Why was Holmes in a "superior position" to stop this? Because he's male? The person in the best position to prevent violence by Alba Ingrid Scarpelli was Alba Ingrid Scarpelli.

As for Beard's odd comment that the man was more culpable -- that means a woman is less culpable for the very abuse she herself is

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

committing. So when a woman commits violence or abuse, consider her less culpable and look around for a man to blame.

Feminists ought to think this over very carefully. Sure they enjoy the smug, morally superior feeling of always holding men more responsible. But decisions like this put women on the level of children -- less capable of knowing right from wrong or controlling their behavior. If we hold men more responsible and punish them for the behavior of women, don't be surprised when men feel they must control the actions of women. Saying that men are always more responsible is a recipe for patriarchy.

But society has always placed higher standards of responsibility on men and punished men far more harshly for not filling their roles. The strongest "traditional gender roles" in force today are those applying to men. At every turn, feminists seek to free themselves of responsibility and tighten the responsibilities placed on men. Feminists want to send men to jail if they don't pay child support, yet feminists vigorously defend women who drink and take drugs while pregnant. The man's responsibility to a child is always greater, even if his rights as a parent are nil.

And that's another troubling aspect of this case: society treats fathers only in terms of responsibilities and not rights. There ought to be a balance between the two. But at present, fathers' responsibilities are taken for granted while their rights are ignored. Fathers are expected to be "on call," fulfilling their commitments every minute of the day right up until a mother or a court official arbitrarily decides to take away a man's children for the rest of his life. Mothers have the rights in such cases -- yet if they abuse, neglect, or murder the children, they will be held less responsible.

Something is not right.

But as for being right, we hope Richard, now 6, will be able to recover from the abuse he suffered at the hands of this woman. He is living with a foster family and talks of having children of his own someday.*

"But he says he'll love his children even if they make mistakes."²²⁵

Understanding the McKinney Verdict

Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney, once the top enlisted man in the Army, is leaving the service after six women accused him of sexual harassment. A military jury acquitted him on all 18 charges of sexual misconduct he faced. However, he was convicted of obstruction of justice -- he was tape-recorded trying to persuade one of his accusers to change her story.

Feminists will have a field day misrepresenting this case. They will say that it proves there is a good-old-boy network in the military that "tolerates" sexual harassment, and so on. They will say that this verdict "sends a bad message."

The fact is, feminists would prefer that nearly every man who is accused be convicted -- to "send the right message." And as for the good-old-boy network, there were women on this jury.

But once we take a closer look at the charges against McKinney, we see how odd and unusual this entire trial was. An informative editorial in USA Today on March 18 provided some interesting facts:

"The Uniform Code of Military Justice does not specifically outlaw sexual harassment. Instead, inappropriate behavior, such as unwanted touching or indecent language, must be prosecuted under statutes that are a poor fit, leaving military prosecutors to leap herculean legal hurdles. McKinney, for instance, was criminally charged with assault and battery for allegedly touching a woman on the arm and trying to pull her toward him. He also faced a possible prison term for allegedly asking a woman to meet him at his hotel for drinks on more than one occasion. Small wonder the jury had trouble finding him guilty 'beyond a reasonable doubt.'"

In the civilian world, the type of offenses McKinney was accused of would have to be dealt with in civil rather than criminal court. That is, a woman who alleged that a man committed such acts would have to bring a

* Katherine Shaver, "Woman Gets 18 Months for Child Abuse: Sentence Too Light for Crime, Montgomery Prosecutors Say," *The Washington Post*, Thursday, February 12, 1998; Page B01. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-02/12/1991-021298-idx.html>>; Amy Klein, "Father Gets 8 Years in Montgomery Abuse Case," *The Washington Post*, Saturday, February 28, 1998; Page B01.)

lawsuit. The police would not come and clap the accused in handcuffs and set him up for a criminal trial. That's because these supposed offenses are not the type of criminal activity or felonies that get folks sent to prison.

In McKinney's case, the military didn't have laws to deal with the accusations against him. So it decided to treat the charges against him like felonies -- things that could get him sent to prison, even if in the civilian world the most that could result was a lawsuit.

No wonder the charges didn't stick. If a town doesn't have a law against littering, would it charge litterbugs with felonious assault?

Beyond the actual verdict, this case raises some interesting issues. Feminists who want women in the military say that women can perform just like men. But we wonder if any man would be bringing criminal charges against a woman for repeatedly asking him out for a drink. This is not a minor issue. Soldiers are expected to defend our society and our freedoms against attack by a violent enemy that will be using weapons far more vicious than a pick-up line. If a woman is so devastated by the types of things McKinney was accused of, is she really ready for the hell of combat?

There was also the racial angle. McKinney is black, and all his accusers are white. In the similar scandal at the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland, all 12 black drill instructors accused of forcing female subordinates to have sex are black. Most of the accusers are white. Five of the putative accusers say Army agents pressured and coerced them into agreeing to the charges.

We are still feeling the fallout of the Air Force's so-called Tailhook scandal. Air Force officials whose job supposedly involves defending our freedoms showed us just how quickly they would collapse and retreat in the face of a feminist assault. Ever since then, military officials have lived in terror, not of Scud missiles or anthrax, but of upsetting the feminist lobby. Innocent men have had their careers ruined by innuendo, and unqualified female pilots have been promoted ahead of men for propaganda purposes -- with deadly results. The hotline that the Army set up to accept sexual har-

assment allegations has been quietly disconnected amid admissions that it was being used to smear men anonymously.

But things might be changing. The Army is now investigating

The Associated Press, citing an article in the Baltimore Sun, said the Army is investigation claims that its investigators coerced the witnesses and targeted only black men.

Acting Army Secretary Robert M. Walker has ordered the Army's inspector general to investigate. Walker wants to know if the investigation used "inappropriate techniques and procedures, knowingly pursued racially motivated allegations and were themselves racially biased while investigating allegations of sex offenses." The NAACP is asking for an outside investigation.

Feminists behind the current sexual-harassment hysteria always claim to be such friends and allies of black people. Curious, then, how everyone accused was black.

Moral of the story: Feminists should stick to attack white males -- the group it's still okay to demonize.

Or maybe it's time for white men to start fighting back the way that black men have never been afraid to do.²²⁶

Depths of Absurdity

Feminists seem to have some men well-trained. It seems there is no accusation so bizarre, and no accuser so loony, that some man won't try to take action.

Consider Corporal Bob Doige of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He relentlessly pursued sexual allegations against three men despite evidence the accusers were unreliable or mentally unstable. Some of the accusations arose from "recovered memory therapy," a feminist pseudo-science that has been shown to produce false memories.

Among Doige's victims, as reported by Rick Ouston of the Vancouver Sun:

Mike Kliman, a vice-principal at John Diefenbaker elementary school, spent five years defending himself against absurd charges based on "recovered memories." The woman who supposedly "recovered" these memories was shown to suffer a psychiatric disorder. Kliman was put through a preliminary hearing, a criminal trial and two appeals before he was finally cleared.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Eric Erickson, a high-school English teacher suspended in 1988 when a female student accused him of rape. Trouble was, "the accuser had audio and visual hallucinations, and was diagnosed as psychotic and heavily drugged. Doige also pressed ahead despite physical evidence that indicated the assault could not have happened."

Kevin O'Farrell, another teacher investigated in 1992 on accusations from his daughter "that he -- and 50 other people -- belonged to a Satanic cult that abused children. The woman, later treated for psychosis, also claimed her mother assaulted her, and that long-suppressed memories had only recently surfaced. ... O'Farrell's other children denied any abuse and a subsequent investigation by now-retired RCMP Chief Superintendent Mike Clegg found the allegations 'bizarre and unbelievable.'"

All three men were exonerated, though they say their ordeals have had lasting consequences. Erickson was so soured by his experience that he has left the teaching profession. And Doige told other teachers who knew O'Farrell about the warped accusations against him. The stigma of the accusation still stalks him.

Clegg wrote O'Farrell a letter of apology in 1994. "All the other allegations made by her are so bizarre and incomprehensible that one has to question Corporal Doige's objectivity and mind set concerning you, a teacher who is being accused."

In a libel case brought by Erickson, Justice Bruce McColl "criticized Doige for asking leading questions of a complainant who was mentally disturbed. ... frequently her answers were a response to questions which in and of themselves suggested the answer," McColl wrote.

An RCMP probe found that Doige took "a very biased position" in the investigation. Yes, men can be biased against other men. It's not only possible, it's one of the planks that feminism is built on.

Doige has taken early retirement. Canada is a little safer for that.

Doige says his belief in Satanic mumbo-jumbo, and his trust in the truth of hallucinating women, is based on his knowledge of recovered memory therapy. That's the tipoff right there.

So-called recovered memory therapy is largely based on the works of two feminists, Ellen Bass and Laura Davis, who have struck it rich with their "The Courage to Heal" books. The original book has sold 750,000 copies and produced all sorts of lucrative spinoffs: workbooks, seminars, etc.

Believers in recovered memory therapy have a circular logic. Everything they see is a symptom of some "repressed" and forgotten sexual abuse. The symptom proves the abuse -- and absolutely everything is a symptom. Feel anxious and tense? Forget things? Dislike small rooms? Surprise -- you're a "survivor" of sexual abuse. Now all you need is for a kind, caring therapist to dredge up all those nasty memories -- at the cost of thousands of dollars.

You *are* insured, right? One of the amazing things about recovered memories is that they are found most often in people with lots of money or plenty of insurance coverage.

Therapy commonly involves drugging patients, hypnotizing them, leading them through highly suggestive "guided imagery" sessions, putting them in cult-like isolation away from family and friends, and doing all manner of things that are known to contaminate memories, implant false or suggestive ideas, and break down a person's resistance to suggestion.

Bass is not a psychotherapist and has no academic background in the field. She started out as a teacher of feminist fiction.

Interesting.

Bass and other "recovered memory" stalwarts are known for their disdain for proof, evidence, and logic. As Bass said, "If we waited for science, we can forget the whole thing."

Well, they didn't wait for science, so we should forget their whole thing. Except we can't. While the cash continues to pour into Bass' "Courage to Heal" coffers, innocent men and women continue to have their lives destroyed by false accusations.

Dr. Elizabeth Loftus, one of the leading experts on false memory, testified as an expert witness for Kliman. But Doige's mind was closed. All he would say about her is "she's a nut."

So Doige believed women who had hallucinations. He believed women who told him

of wild satanic bacchanals that no one else witnessed. He believed women whose stories were contradicted by physical evidence. Yet when he's confronted with credible, valid scientific research, his response is "she's a nut."

Most of all, he believed some of the wildest propaganda ever put out by feminists.*

When feminists call, there still are plenty of obedient little men like Doige who have *The Courage to Heel*.

Meanwhile, in Australia, the Upper House MP Mrs. Franca Arena has a story to tell that makes Mr. Doige look like Sherlock Holmes. Mrs. Arena says an informant has told her about a conspiracy in which babies are being bred in a Melbourne castle as fodder for a Satanic cult. The informant supposedly witnessed a certain "Judge B" hack another judge to death with an axe in order to succeed him as a leading world satanist. And people have been crucified at the castle and their body parts used in satanic ritual abuse. And she's saying there's a conspiracy of high-ranking pedophiles to cover it all up.

Have we buried the needle on the goofometer yet?

But Mrs. Arena admitted in March 5 testimony to the Upper House Privileges Committee that she never checked the allegations before making them public. "I am not a policeman," she said.

She also admitted that she was "not telling the truth" when she told reporters several times last year she would name politicians and judges as pedophiles. "I was trying to scare people off," she said.

Of her supposed informant, she says: "Maybe she has exaggerated, but there might be also a basis of truth to what she said." She describes her informant as "a very credible witness."

Another allegation she never bothered checking before she made it was the accusation that a certain Mr. D. was filmed having sex with boys at a Sydney hotel. During her testimony, she was told that it could be proved that the man was not at the hotel.

"What can I say?" Mrs. Arena answered.†

Said committee member Mr. Richard Jones: "You could say you got it wrong."²⁷

Depths of Dishonesty

After all the dirty tricks we've seen feminists pull, we shouldn't be surprised anymore. After all the Super Bowl hoaxes, the faked research, the pseudo-science, the "rule of thumb" myths, the false accusations, and the blatant stereotypes, we shouldn't be surprised anymore.

But sometimes feminists pull off something that is slimy even by their standards. Such a deal was done recently at New York State Electric and Gas Corporation of Binghamton.

It concerns men who had been hired for full-time jobs, but on a temporary basis. The men who wanted permanent jobs were put on a waiting list. When permanent jobs opened up, they were supposed to get first chance at them. They worked faithfully at their temporary jobs, building seniority.

And permanent jobs did open up. But that's when the dirty tricks began.

On Sept. 3, 1993, five men were laid off -- for one day. They were re-hired the next day, but this sleight-of-hand had caused them to lose seniority.

So the permanent jobs went to women from the office. They were all temporary clerical workers, all women, and none with any experience in the jobs they were getting. Men who had been doing those jobs for three years or more were denied the jobs -- because they supposedly lacked "seniority."

There is something fundamentally dishonest about feminism's claim that discriminating against men somehow constitutes "equality." When feminists are that cynical about honesty, it's no wonder they stoop to dirty tricks like the one pulled against these men at New York State Electric and Gas. Feminists claim that they just want a "level playing field." But what they actually do is find ways to cheat men out of what they've earned -- in the interest of "equality."

Shame on New York State Electric and Gas Corp. for such a dishonest move. If this

* "Three discredited sex cases linked" *Vancouver Sun*, n.d. available at: <http://www.vancouver.sun.com/newsite/news/1651037.html>

† David Humphries, "Arena admits never intending to name names," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, March 19, 1998. Available at: <http://www.smh.com.au/daily/content/980319/national/national4.html>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

is a public utility, maybe someone ought to pull some plugs.

This is nothing but a disguised, off-the-books form of affirmative action. Maybe feminists are practicing covert affirmative action because society is becoming increasingly aware that anti-male discrimination is wrong, and that it is discrimination no matter what nice label you slap on it. People are beginning to see through decades of feminist misrepresentation and half-truths about the "glass ceiling." They are seeing that what feminists want isn't equality, it's advantage -- no matter how dirty they play to get it, no matter how many innocent people they cheat.

Enough people have seen this in California that they voted to end discrimination in state contracting. The good news: earlier this month, the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals made its final ruling in the Proposition 209 case -- overturning contract preferences. Then Governor Pete Wilson signed an executive order terminating discrimination in the awarding of contracts.

The Proposition 209 debate showed feminists at their dirtiest. They tried to claim that ordinary folks who didn't want to be discriminated against were a bunch of demonic backslashers and Klansmen. Perhaps the strategy backfired. People got a good look at the dishonesty and hatred coming from the feminist camp, and voted overwhelmingly for Proposition 209 in 1996.

Proposition 209 says state and local governments cannot "discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin." No wonder feminists hate it. It doesn't allow them to discriminate anymore.

And another encouraging note: the decision reached beyond California. Last year, the U.S. Supreme Court let Proposition 209 stand.

But the essential dishonesty among feminists has never been resolved. They still wish to paint people as being evil simply because those people don't want to be discriminated against.

If feminists honestly wanted to compete for jobs fairly, they would understand why people don't want to be discriminated against. Feminists themselves don't want to

be discriminated against. But they sure want to do it to others. And they claim that that position is "moral."

Take the recent case at the Seattle Post-Intelligencer. Veteran journalist Lawrence "Bud" Withers was passed over for a sports columnist job because of affirmative action policies that called for hiring a woman, Laura Vecsey.

Withers is suing. We hope he wins.

The newspaper's editor and publisher, J.D. Alexander, admits that Vecsey's female voice and the "fact that she is female" were factors in the decision to hire her. Alexander also said the paper was trying to promote "diversity."

You know what diversity means. It means that discrimination against men is always right and discrimination against women is always wrong. Oddly enough, there never seems to be any need for diversity once women make up the top management or the majority of workers in any field.

Alexander's statements are "direct evidence that raises an inference of discriminatory motive" sufficient to let Withers take his case to trial, the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said in a 3-0 ruling.

Personally, we think sports coverage is one of the worst places to be practicing "affirmative action," because there is no affirmative action on the playing field. Once the color barrier in sports fell, minority athletes excelled -- on their own merits. No one added extra yards to their running or extra hits to their stats. They earned it every step of the way.

Meanwhile, covering the people who do the real work are columnists who got there not because of what they can do but who they can manipulate.²²⁸

More Choices Without Voices

In Houston, Evonne Rodriguez was acquitted of capital murder after allegedly strangling her 4-month-old son with rosary beads. She got off by claiming an insanity defense.

Crazy? Like a fox. She first made up a story about the boy being abducted. Apparently she was sane enough to try to mislead investigators.

But she eventually confessed. However, she was acquitted, partly on the idea that she

suffered from post-partum depression. She is sentenced to treatment.

There was a bit more justice in Medina, Ohio, where a former cheerleader was convicted of involuntary manslaughter in her baby's death and sentenced to eight years. Audrey Iacona was accused of suffocating the premature, 3.8-pound boy and stuffing him in garbage bags -- the swaddling clothes of the feminist movement.

This case reminds us somewhat of the British nanny case involving Louise Woodward. Just as with the Woodward case, there were those who could not accept that a young woman might kill, and there were those who were angry that she'd be punished even if she did. Defense lawyer Richard Marco said "She is a girl who is not a danger to society." This is the typical response when women kill children: they're only killing children, so they're not a danger to the rest of us. We suppose you could argue that a lot of men who beat their wives are also not a danger to society at large, but we doubt many feminists would let them take a pass.

Meanwhile, at the Walt Disney World amusement park in Orlando, Florida, a newborn girl was found abandoned in a toilet, apparently left to die. The mother was identified as a 43-year-old tourist who has returned to the Philippines, where she won't have to face U.S. charges of attempted murder and child abuse.

The good news is the little girl is doing fine and there is a foster family interested in adopting her.

A cleaning woman at St. Paul's College in Lawrenceville, Virginia, recently discovered a newborn baby, dead, on the concrete floor of a garbage room on campus. Emergency crews called to the scene then made a second shocking discovery: the body of a second newborn, dead, behind a door.

"There is a lot of disappointment and dismay here that a couple of young lives didn't have a better chance," Lawrenceville Police Chief Douglas Pond said.*

Remember, chief: to feminists, they're not lives -- they're choices.²²⁹

Humor: Checks and Balances

In Nicaragua, a young woman has created a national scandal by accusing her step-father of molesting and sexually abusing her from the time she was 11 years old until adulthood.

Her name is Zoilamerica Narvaez Murillo. You might have heard of her step-father. He is Daniel Ortega.

Yes, the same Daniel Ortega who led the Sandinista National Liberation Front. The same Daniel Ortega who became the darling of ultraliberals who believe that "Marxist" and "far left" are synonyms for "moral" and "ethically pure." Narvaez said that much of the abuse went on while Ortega was president.²³⁰

If her story is true, it is indeed tragic. But there are lessons to be learned.

For one thing, it demonstrates the differences between totalitarian regimes and a democracy like the good old U.S. of A.

Unlike the Sandinista government, a democracy has a system of checks and balances. One part of the government keeps track of another part, making sure the other does not abuse its power.

That's part of what makes America great. In America, we have a system of checks and balances on the president's ability to harass, abuse, fondle and grope women. All such actions must be cleared with the feminist branch before they can proceed.

With checks and balances come safeguards. In America, if feminists do not approve of the way a senator kisses women, he can be removed from office.

In America, vigilant and dedicated feminists are alert to make sure that only good and correct sexual harassment is permitted. Harassment by politicians who have not met feminist approval will be dealt with harshly.

Is this a great country, or what? So remember the political rule of checks and balances: send feminists the checks, and make sure they balance.²³¹

Wiley and the Hand Jive

(Sung to the tune of "Willie and the Hand Jive," of course.)

* Eric L. Wee, "Mother of Dead Infants Sought: Police Question Students at Va. College Where Babies Were Found," *The Washington Post*, Wednesday, February 18, 1998; Page B04. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-02/18/1181-021898-idx.html>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

*I know a cat named Kathleen Willey.
Got a story 'bout the president, it's a dilly.
Asked Bill Clinton to lend a hand.
He did a lot more than she had planned.*

*Times are tough, and she starts to sob:
"I need your help for a steady job.
"The White House staff is what I'd like to
join."*

*So he put her hand right on his groin.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Do that crazy hand jive.*

*Mama, mama, look at Ed Bradley
Talking 'bout hand jive on TV.
"60 Minutes" is the thing to watch
For all your news on the executive crotch.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Do that crazy hand jive.*

*Spin doctor and lawyer and White House
chief
Hardly can hide their disbelief.
But all the prez's men have a job to do,
To beat up any woman who dares say
"boo."*

*After Paula and Monica and Gennifer,
The feminists say they still aren't sure.
"We wait and see and just keep still,
"Unlike we did with Anita Hill."
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Do that crazy hand jive.*

*Say Ms. Hillary, where are you?
Does he make you do that hand jive too?
Maybe you're off spending all your time
Watching the way cattle futures climb.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Hand jive.
Do that crazy hand jive.²³²*

bly know that women live an average of seven years longer than men and that feminists are stridently insisting that we spend more on women's health. It's the Titanic Syndrome all over again. Men's lives are considered more expendable than women's, and feminist are determined to see that this traditional gender role is enforced. But in this issue of MANifesto we look at some myths surrounding both the Titanic and men's health. Prosit!

It's Men's Lifestyle that Kills'Em

If you've engaged in any debate with feminists over health issues, then you know the drill. The feminist will insist that if men aren't living as long as women, it's because men do stupid things. So we might as well go on taking the tax dollars that all of us pay and shoveling them disproportionately to ensure the health, safety, and self-actualization of women, they will say.

Feminists will say that any difference between men's and women's health is because of lifestyle choices men make -- to smoke, drink, take stressful jobs, etc. If you point out to the feminists that men make up 96 percent of the people killed on the job, they will shrug it off. It doesn't matter to them that society places a much higher burden on men to be wage earners -- it's still seen as a lifestyle choice when men have no choice but to take dangerous jobs.

However, as soon as you point out that dangerous jobs pay more, feminists suddenly demand equality. Any "gap" in wages between men and women is unfair, they say. It doesn't matter to them if women drop in and out of the workforce, or get college degrees in areas that are less financially rewarding, or if women pursue jobs that are "fulfilling" rather than well-paying. All of the sudden, the lifestyle differences no longer count. Now it's time for "equality." And when it comes to health, lifestyle differences *do* count, and there's no need for equality.

For example, men in Western societies die about ten years earlier than women from heart disease. The "lifestyle" argument is a convenient way for feminists to avoid equality. Instead of insisting that more of our shared tax money be spent to improve men's health, they stereotype men, then demand the money be spent on breast cancer or girl's

APRIL 1998

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue where we say "To Health With Men." You proba-

"self-esteem" programs. This despite the fact that heart problems are the leading cause of death among men and women.

However, new research is showing that differences in liver proteins may account for men dying younger from heart disease. According to an Associated Press story: "Differences in traditional risk factors -- high blood pressure, smoking and obesity, among others -- do not entirely explain this disparity, nor do the obvious hormonal and physical differences. ... a liver enzyme called hepatic lipase may well explain why women typically have better cholesterol levels than men, especially before menopause when their risk of heart trouble is very low."

(Source: "Liver protein may explain younger women's low risk of heart disease," By Daniel Q. Haney, AP Medical Editor.)

So now that we know it's not just lifestyle choices, can we expect feminists to lead the charge for equality in health care? Don't hold your breath: that's as futile as looking for a fair feminist. Feminists have always demanded that they retain their traditional rights and privileges while men give theirs up. Feminists have not slackened for a moment their drive to have your money spent on improving their health.

And here's more news on the notion that boys have it so much better than girls in our world. From an Associated Press story: "Some studies have indicated male fetuses are more vulnerable than females to prenatal exposure to toxic substances, and either die before birth or are born with defects or a susceptibility to cancer." This might help explain the fact that the ratio of male births to female births has dropped slightly between 1970 and 1990 in the United States and Canada. Environmental factors such as prenatal exposure to pesticides are some of the suspected causes. "The declines began even earlier in several other industrialized countries and corresponded with increases in some male birth defects and prenatal exposure to pesticides and industrial chemicals, said Devra Lee Davis, an environmental epidemiologist at the World Resources Institute, a Washington-based policy-research institute."

"Some, as yet unrecognized, environmental health hazards are affecting the sex ratio of births as well as other unexplained defects

in male reproduction," Davis and her colleagues concluded. Their analysis appears in the April 1st edition of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*.*

Why do feminists demand so much more money for women's health when women outlive men by seven years? It certainly makes feminists look as though they are hostile to the lives of men -- or at least that they are showing a remarkable lack of respect for human life while they also demand absolute respect for women's sensitivities.

Feminism's attitude smacks of the Titanic Syndrome: that the lives, safety, and property of women must be guaranteed by sacrificing the lives of men. But of all the money that is being shoveled into women's health research, the largest share of it is coming from men. Males start work at younger ages, stay in the workforce more consistently, and work more years than women. Thus they pay more taxes. Then feminists demand that this money, created mostly by the labor of men, goes to the continuation of female privilege.

It is time for feminists to stop looking on men as pack animals who exist for the purpose of delivering goods for the benefit of feminists. That attitude is the antithesis of equality.²³³

Clinton to Veterans: Drop Dead

In order to save money, President Clinton wants to deny service-connected disability benefits to military veterans who have smoking-related illnesses. The exception would be for those who could show they developed the illnesses on active duty. But, as we all know, those illnesses don't always show up until years later.

Clinton says that denying such benefits would save an estimated \$10.5 billion over five years.

We're not really surprised that Mr. Clinton feels this way. His administration has been singularly hostile toward men in general and the military in particular.

But Clinton is ignoring the long and active role that the military and government have played in getting soldiers to smoke in the first place. From the Civil War until 1956, Congress instructed the Army "to cause

* Lindsey Tanner, "Report suggests environmental factors might be behind dip in male births," *Associated Press*, n.d.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

tobacco to be furnished to the enlisted men ... at cost prices, exclusive of the cost of transportation, in such quantities as they require, not exceeding 16 ounces per month." Free cigarettes were included with C-rations given to troops in the field well into the 1970's. Post exchanges have continued to sell tobacco products at discounts. But health warning labels that were put on tobacco sold to the general public were kept off products distributed to the military until 1970.

In addition, the military always made sure that tobacco had a part in military life. "The smoking lamp is lit. Smoke 'em if you got 'em."

The government drafted men, placed them in dangerous and stressful situations, then offered them cigarettes and encouraged them to smoke. Then, when the men are no longer of any use, when the men might ask something back from their country, people like Clinton want to throw those men away like a smoked butt.

Clinton says the estimated \$10.5 billion saved over five years could be used to increase highway construction.

So we have a Modest Proposal. Mr. Clinton, why not just start plowing our veterans under as the bottom layer of our highways? You would save on gravel, and still have billions more left over.

Meanwhile, let's turn to a group called the Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research. Yes, there is a group with such a sexist name and sexist purpose. While women outlive men by seven years, groups like this are determined to push for greater inequality, so long as it favors women.

Still not convinced this group is sexist? Well, check out its recent initiative to ban all tobacco advertising targeted at women.

The group isn't out to ban all tobacco advertising, mind you. The group wants yet another special protection for women, and wants to revive the Victorian notion that women must be protected from thinking for themselves or making their own choices.

The group bases its sexist campaign on the idea that women are more likely to develop lung cancer than men. We don't know where they got this piece of propaganda. Last time we checked the figures, men were dying at younger ages from virtually all of the major

killers, from disease to accidents. Be that as it may, we wonder just how it would be perceived if some group launched an initiative to protect only men. Since men make up 96 percent of those who are killed on the job, what if a group launched an initiative to save only the lives of men? You can bet feminist leaders would attack that group with all the vitriol they can muster. Thinking only of the lives of men would be seen as sexist.

But thinking only of the lives of women is par for the course. It's been drummed into us both by centuries of patriarchy and by decades of anti-male feminism. The Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research is just the latest example of the Titanic Mentality. The fact that such a group can exist without being shamed out of existence is further proof how little we value the lives of men -- and how anti-male bigotry has become entirely acceptable today.²³⁴

Titanic Myths

One of the great canards of feminism is that women on every social level were always at a disadvantage compared to men on that same social level. You can point out to feminists that there were wealthy, upperclass women and poor men, but feminists will always finesse this. They will claim that whatever the social level, the women were at a disadvantage to the men there. Thus they claim victimhood for upperclass women while pretending that poor men somehow had some massive "privilege" of being male.

Actually, it might well be the other way around.

Consider the most important aspect of life: whether you get to keep it.

Spurred on by the blockbuster film "Titanic," The Daily Telegraph newspaper of London examined documents from the Britain's Public Records Office. In particular, it looked at survival rates for those traveling first, second, and third class. This was prompted by the film's depiction of third-class passengers being locked below decks as the liner sinks.

The documents showed that more men from third class survived than men from second class. So much for the class-warfare propaganda of this commercially successful film.

The paper also gave survival rates by travel class and by sex. The results are revealing. The survival rates:

First-Class Women: 97 percent
 First-Class Men: 34 percent
 Second-Class Women: 84 percent
 Second-Class Men: 8 percent
 Third-Class Women: 55 percent
 Third-Class Men: 12 percent

So poor women from third-class, women supposedly facing all sorts of cultural and economic prejudices, were much more likely to survive than men from first class! In second class, women were ten times more likely to survive than men. Women had great survival rates in all classes. The lowest survival rate for women -- 55 percent in second class -- is almost double the highest survival rate for men!

Particularly interesting is 97 percent survival rate for women in first class. The upper class has always been a breeding ground for feminist elitists -- privileged, university-educated women who live better than nearly any group in history and still insist they're oppressed. Maybe such women have simply come to expect total deference, safety, and protection. Perhaps such prosperous, pampered, protected feminists have come to expect aristocratic privilege and are outraged when society treats them equally.²³⁵

The Cheapness of Male Life

When men and women are discussing the harder, more dangerous work that men do, one example that keeps cropping up is mining. And the feminist response is often predictable: she'll say there aren't that many miners anymore, and that mines are pretty safe anyway.

But a recent in-depth series by the Louisville Courier-Journal shows just how dangerous mining still is. More to the point, it shows that mines are dangerous because the lives of men are considered cheaper than the costs it would require to make mines safe.

And the numbers are not small. "Between 1972 and 1994, the deaths of 54,248 U.S. miners were blamed at least partly on black lung. ... The number of (currently) sick miners is unknown, but government studies indicate that between 1,600 and 3,600 working miners -- and many retirees -- have one

of the lung disorders collectively called black lung." These are just the documented cases. There is such a push on to save money by denying disability benefits to miners, we wonder how many men have died without being diagnosed.

The government orders mines to test the air for dust particles. But large numbers of miners interviewed by the paper in a year-long investigation said that these tests are regularly falsified, and that miners themselves are ordered to fake the tests under fear of being fired. The tests are faked for one basic reason: complying with clean-air standards in mines would be too expensive. So it's easier and cheaper to sacrifice the lives of men.

"You either do it (cheat on the air tests) or the mine shuts down," said Elmer Causey, 43, of Viper, Ky. He left mining in 1992 with black lung. "And if the mine shuts down, you ain't got no job. And if you ain't got no job, you got no food on the table."

Most damning of all is this finding: "While the federal government has known of the widespread cheating for more than 20 years, it has done little to stop it because of other priorities and a reluctance to confront coal operators. ... The Mine Safety and Health Administration ignored these obviously fraudulent samples for more than 20 years, until The Courier-Journal began asking about them late last year. The agency also paid little attention during the 1970s and 1980s to government auditors and outside experts who repeatedly warned about dust-test fraud. ... But black-lung researchers said the lower incidence of the disease among British miners -- who work in government-owned mines where dust-test cheating is rare -- is strong evidence that hundreds of American miners fall ill every year because of widespread fraud."

So, Americans, this is your government. The same one that carries the favor of feminists by spending countless dollars on improving girls' "self-esteem." This government cannot be bothered to clean up the dust that scars men's lungs and eventually causes them to literally die of suffocation.

Maybe we need a "Take Your Feminist To Work Day" in the coal mines.

Moreover, many of the men who come down with black lung are then denied disa-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

bility payments. After all, if the mines are clean, how could they get black lung?

"In the past 10 years, just 4 percent of those who applied for (federal) benefits won them on the first try, according to a federal analysis. When appeals are taken into account, the number rises to 7.5 percent. In fiscal year 1997, 418 people won benefits while 6,791 filed claims. The appeals process sometimes takes as long as 20 years, and hundreds of miners die before a decision is reached."

One surprise in the series is the danger of mining that goes on above ground -- surface mining, or so-called strip mining. The dust is often heavier in strip mines than it is underground. "Miners who spend at least 20 years as strip-mine drillers have a 61 percent chance of contracting silicosis, a virulent form of black lung. No other job in coal mining has such a high risk. ... It's an epidemic that experts say could have been prevented by a few simple precautions by coal operators and better monitoring by the federal government." Various surveys found that 9 percent of strip miners had symptoms of black lung.

"You can't run a mine, make money and pass a dust test. The profit margins are too slim," said Paul Gilliam, 46, of Mayking, Ky., who retired in 1991 after 22 years as a mine superintendent and foreman. So if you are reading this anywhere in the U.S. where your electricity is generated by coal, you are reading this because the lives of men have been sacrificed to provide your electricity.

Maybe you remember how Gloria Steinem, Naomi Wolf and other anti-male feminists helped foster the myth of an anorexia "Holocaust" in which, supposedly "about 150,000 females die of anorexia each year" in the United States alone. The claim was shown to be bogus, though it attracted widespread belief at first. Safe, privileged feminists like Steinem and Wolf need to create false states of victimhood to distract us from the fact that a great deal of commercial activity is built on the principle that it is cheaper to risk a male life than to make the work safer.

So imagine all those feminists sitting at their computers, typing up new theories of how they are "oppressed" -- and sending them along with the help of power made

cheap because the lives of men are cheaper.²³⁶

Wil Hetherington and Fred Dever

At Per's MANifesto, we don't often ask readers to take pen in hand and take action on individual cases. We kind of leave it up to you to get involved if you see something that motivates you. But this time we're asking you to do something for a pair of men who have faced some of the ugliest injustices we've ever seen. We don't ask you to write letters very often, but this time we're really pleading. Please help.

The two cases involve Wil Hetherington and Fred Dever.

Wil Hetherington was convicted of spousal rape in 1986 despite a total lack of evidence -- and a good deal of evidence that today proves his innocence.

His wife accused him during a bitter divorce and custody dispute. It was expected that Will would win custody, because his wife had abandoned the family for more than two months.

The doctor who examined her testified that he found no injury whatsoever and that this was unusual when a woman is claiming forceful intrusion.

The prosecutor introduced a pair of his wife's blue jeans containing sperm. Yet there is no sperm in Wil's semen, because he had a vasectomy several years before. This fact was not realized until Wil had been in prison for nine years. There is no way the substance on those jeans was from him -- even though it was used to convict him.

On the day of the alleged rape, Linda Hetherington had visited her boy friend before going to visit Wil. It is suspected that the semen on the blue jeans is that of the boy friend. He was never called to testify at the trial.

Although sentencing guidelines call for 1 to 10 years, Wil was sentenced to 30 years, amid suspicions that several of the officials involved were grandstanding for feminist votes.

At the time of Wil's trial, his assets were frozen because of the divorce proceedings. The court refused to recognize this and would not appoint legal counsel for him. Meanwhile, his accuser had the power of the

state behind her, for free, as accusers usually do.

Wil was unable to file an appeal since he did not have the funds for a transcript of the original trial.

This case is an absolutely shameful miscarriage of justice that should make everyone cringe, no matter what your politics are.

Please visit these sites* and learn more about how you can help Wil Hetherington.[†]

And now for the tragedy of Fred Dever and his daughter.

Fred is in prison for eight years on a charge of raping his daughter -- although his daughter herself has repeatedly told everyone that this never happened. He was convicted on hearsay testimony -- incredible as that seems.

The judge would not believe the daughter when she repeatedly said it never happened. According to the Fred Dever Page, the judge had political aspirations and wished to show he was tough on crime. Though videotapes show the daughter repeatedly denying that any incident occurred, she was ruled "incompetent" to testify. She's now 13 and continues to insist nothing happened.[‡]

From a web page on his case:

"Noted psychologist Hollida Wakefield, an expert in the area of child abuse, viewed the videotape of Kristen's interview and found that "The 10/23/87 interview of Kristen Dever ... is extremely leading, suggestive and coercive." Debbie Nathan, another expert in this area, interviewed on the Donahue show, said the methods used to interview Kristen Dever have long been abandoned as inappropriate in such cases."²³⁷

Addendum

* There are two pages that we know of for Wil: <<http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Lobby/4398/wil.htm>> and <<http://www.ncfm.org/will.htm>>

[†] Donations to The William J. Hetherington Defense Fund can be sent to: NCFM (Wil Hetherington Defense Fund) PO Box 129, Manhasset NY 11030

[‡] The Dever case may be featured on "Turning Point" and the Montel Williams Show. See the page at: <<http://members.aol.com/jlaigle/home.htm>>

You can snail mail him at: Fredrick M. Dever, Jr. #206-152 P.O. Box 69 LoCI 8 Dorm, London, Ohio 43140-0069.

Please, readers, visit these sites and take action. If our system is a system of justice, it must admit when injustice has occurred. Thank you in advance for your time and effort.

Well, the National Organization for Women should be changing its name pretty soon to "The National Organization for Some Feminists Whose Politics are the Same as Ours."

NOW has declared that it will not file legal papers on behalf of Paula Jones in her sexual harassment case against President Clinton.

Moreover, this was not some top-down decision of the national leadership of NOW. The group said that local chapters nationwide as well as its national board were overwhelmingly opposed to helping Jones. NOW President Patricia Ireland said contacts with about 500 chapters around the country indicated that members opposed filing a friend-of-the-court brief, by margins of at least 8-to-1 and possibly 10-to-1.

Ireland said the group believes such a "highly charged political" lawsuit should not be used as a test case.

Of course that never stopped NOW from joining in highly charged political action against Clarence Thomas. Or against Bob Packwood. Or against Mitsubishi Motors and any of the other cases in which NOW and other feminists have sought to play unproven accusations for political and financial gain.

Ms. Ireland also said her group "decided not to work with the disreputable right-wing organizations." NOW's hypocrisy on this issue guarantees its status as a disreputable left-wing organization.

And in another matter.

You may remember the case of the British nanny Louise Woodward, who bashed in a little boy's skull while in the United States and got away with a slap on the wrist. People around the world, but particularly in her native land, insisted that there was no way she could possibly be guilty.

Well, we hate to call it poetic justice. But in London, a nanny is charged in the death of a six-month old baby, Caroline Jengen, who suffered severe brain injuries. The nanny, Louise Nicole Sullivan, 26, is from Australia.

So far there have been no massive outbreaks of protest in England declaring that Sullivan can't possibly be guilty.²³⁸

A Letter to Manifesto

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

At Per's MANifesto, we get lots of letters from irate feminists. Most are brief flames and insults, and we post many of these on the MANifesto letters page...*

But recently we received a letter that plumbs the depths of feminist thought and double standards so well that we thought we'd pass it on, with our comments. (The feminist's comments are in quotation marks below, and our comments are in parentheses.)

The letter began "Dear Par." (So much for feminist research.) It then went on to say:

"The greater problem with extremist *anything* is that there is ALWAYS a hidden agenda which is often far more sinister than the "face value" of the cause. What I see here is "extremist ANTI-feminism", and I'm just wondering what YOUR hidden agenda is? Not that I'd expect you to tell me, of course. That fact that you have single-handedly (apparently) devoted the time and energy to a work of this magnitude suggests a very large and sinister hidden agenda indeed."[†]

(This feminist finds it astounding that anyone would object to man-bashing, which, of course, has become the norm in much of Western society. It boggles her mind that anyone would object to demonizing half the human race in the name of "equality." She can't seem to comprehend that any man would object to being denied a job because of his sex -- or that any wife would object to her husband facing anti-male discrimination. Unable to comprehend such acts, she is sure that there must not only be a hidden agenda, but that the agenda is "sinister." As a feminist, we think the lady protests to much about hidden agendas.)

"The best way to deal with extremist *anything* is to completely ignore it, (unless they are packing a nuclear weapon or some other un-natural force, of course-<g>)."

(This is a standard line from feminists when confronted with the extremists in their own ranks. They demand that we ignore the extremists. Of course, they never ignore extremists on the other side of the political fence. Nor should they, in our opinion. But

the demand that we ignore extremist feminists is a curious one. If feminists were truly opposed to gender hatred and gender stereotypes, they would be leading the charge against man-hating extremists, rather than trying to throw a protective cloak around them. Also, it's interesting that she's not ignoring Per's MANifesto, even though she's just appointed it to be some sort of extremist conspiracy. Funny how the standards she preaches are not the ones she obeys.)

"Extremists thrive on the attention they receive. What you are doing here is adding fuel to the extremist feminism fire."

(Actually, the only thing necessary for evil to succeed is for good people to do nothing. If extremist feminists thrive on the attention they receive, why would they work so hard to silence and censor those who disagree with them?)

"Feminism is fizzling out. People are sick and tired of hearing about it. Even many one-time feminists themselves."

(Is this woman trying to claim she's not a feminist? Her defense of feminist extremist and her own anti-male attitudes below indicate this is a bit of a ruse. At any rate, with anti-male attitudes so common today -- you can't turn on TV without witnessing man-bashing ads and shows -- we wonder if feminist extremist has fizzled out or merely gone mainstream.)

"Here, you continue to turn over the logs, add a bit more kindling, and occasionally, a good dose of petrol to really keep the fire burning. You're failing to realise a very simple, time-worn, overused-liche-but-underused-in-principle, basic rule of common sense. That is, you can't fight fire with fire."

(With feminists, this comment translates to: "I support feminists using firing and demand that you don't use it." But anti-male feminism is a real force in the real world, and it's not something that men and women can always just ignore. When you're denied a job or promotion because you're male, or when your husband is denied a job or promotion, it's not good to say "just ignore it." When up to 30 percent or more of rape accusations are against innocent men, it's not good enough to say we should just ignore it,

* See: <<http://idt.net/~per2/letters.htm>>

[†] Subject: RE: Your Web Site... From: Rede Satellite <satellite@ozemail.com.au> Date: Fri, 13 Mar 1998

and when feminists work to reduce the burden of proof and make it harder for innocent men to defend themselves, those men have no luxury of just ignoring it. Wil Hetherington and Fred Dever, cited above, are sitting in prison -- which makes it hard to ignore the hysteria that put them there. When feminists get innocent parents -- mothers and fathers -- arrested on spurious charges arising from "recovered memories," having your family destroyed is not something you just ignore. When men are fired or punished because feminists use false accusations of sexual harassment as a tool of office politics, it's not something a man can ignore.)

"Now remember, we are only talking about extremists here. Nobody can deny that women have suffered poorer conditions in the past. But all that has changed to some degree, and continues to change today, and will continue to change in the future. But an inherent equilibrium WILL be reached over time. It has to - it is the way of things. This process will happen naturally."

(The sexism comes shining through. Women always "suffered poorer conditions in the past," even when getting on the lifeboats first. The fact that women have never been drafted, that men have always done the worst of the heaviest, dirtiest, most dangerous jobs, and that men make far greater personal and physical sacrifices to achieve their goals is turned by feminists into victimhood for women! If men made greater sacrifices, we'd expect some difference in the outcomes of their lives. Feminists demand equal results without equal work. And they assume this will come to them naturally -- like some sort of entitlement.)

"Many people probably aren't even aware of the slowly, but steadily encroaching masculinism movement. What then? We will eventually see the same old bullshit replayed in an inverted format."

(The advancement of democracy has been made possible by men making sacrifices and then passing rights and freedoms on to women. The advancement of feminism has always been women demanding men make more sacrifices while feminists reduce men's rights to hold jobs or speak freely. The flow of rights and the sacrifices has so far been a

one-way transaction. You can talk to us about the "same old bullshit replayed in an inverted format" when you get drafted and we get to take away your rights to free speech because we deem you sexist.)

"The critical failure in society is people failing to love and appreciate themselves for their own merits and to develop their own sense of character. Instead, they take the (apparently) easy path of trying to tear down everybody else to their own level, whilst scoring a few brownie points from misguided followers along the way."

(Scarcely have we seen a better description of feminism.)

"This is what I see here. So, I would ask you again. What drives YOU to this extremist course of action?"

(Interesting that objecting to anti-male sexism and anti-male feminism is now classified as an "extremist course of action." Notice how feminists always try to demonize anyone who objects to their prejudices.)

"ON ANOTHER ISSUE... The cases of injustice that you have pointed out throughout your web site are simply pathetic when compared to the grand schema of things. Have you bothered to do this at all??! How can you compare a psychotic prostitute who kills a couple, (even in the most gruesome way), with a guy who rapes then kills a teenage girl? How many guys have raped and killed teenage girls, (let alone adolescents, toddlers, and even babies), versus psychotic prostitutes killing couples - in the most gruesome of ways??"

(Here is where her anti-male bigotry shows most clearly. When confronted with multiple and irrefutable evidence contradicting the stereotype that violence is a male thing, she simply dismisses it. It doesn't fit into her "schema of things." She quickly dredges up stereotypes of male violence in order to return herself to her morally superior self image. Unlike feminists, we have always condemned violence by members of our own sex. But feminists like this one aren't much interested in condemning violence by member of their sex. Instead they find ways to ignore it. They then return safely to their illusion of pure women and evil men. But we can't help feel that helpless children killed by their mothers, or toddlers

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

abused and starved by their grandmothers, or husbands killed because of a woman's jealously, ego or greed, are more than just inconvenient details in the "schema of things." Actually, when a child is killed by a parent, the parent is usually female. And mothers tend to kill boys more than they kill girls. I don't think we can play scorecard with such deaths. The victims are just as dead. Female violence is not an *exception* to the grand scheme of things.)

"How do you account for the fact that a good 90% of the worlds hardened criminals are male??"

(We'd account for it in many ways that are never apparent to those who wish to label men as evil. Hardened criminals are the ones sent to prison to become hardened in the first place. If women get offered lighter, shorter sentences -- or no sentences at all -- and counseling and therapy while men get sent for hard time, is it any wonder the men turn out harder? British nanny Louise Woodward got hardly a slap on the wrist for bashing in a little boy's skull. Woodward will go home while a man would have gone to prison. Woodward will not be given the chance to become a hardened criminal.

(Overall, males are treated far more harshly from the very beginnings of their lives. As infants, they are held less often, left alone more, comforted less. As toddlers, they are told to suppress their emotions and are ridiculed or punished if they don't. They are put into activities designed to "toughen" them. Punishment for boys is always harsher and more physical than punishment for girls even for similar actions. Boys are far more likely to be struck, slapped, spanked, yanked, shaken, pushed, etc. This builds up an anger in boys, and it teaches them that violence is acceptable.

(And then we act surprised when boys commit violence, and sexist bigots like her conclude it's their maleness that's the problem.

(Feminists claim that most differences between men and women are due to socialization. But when we treat little boys far differently and far more violently, we somehow seem to assume that the outcome is due to the *boys* being innately bad.)

"I would bet anything that that prostitute was at some time sexually abused earlier in her life - possibly by her father or close male relative. Where does the blame then lie??"

(Of course you would. Whenever a woman commits an offense, feminists look for the man to blame. But when you were claiming that 90 percent of the hardened criminals are men, you didn't bother asking if they had been mistreated.)

"These are greater questions than the floss that makes up the bulk of your web site. Sincerely, Rede Satellite"

(Ms. Satellite has presented here a fair compendium of anti-male stere types and double standards. Her attitudes are not particularly unusual among t day's anti-male crowd. She merely presented a rather extensive catalogue of them in one missive.)²³⁹

MAY 1998

WELCOME, READERS: We need a title for this issue, so we'll just MAKE SOMETHING UP. Actually, that's an appropriate title, because it concerns feminists and their penchant for making things up. We'll examine phony charges that have sent men to jail. We'll examine phony grievances feminists have invented to claim "bias against women." Well discuss nurses who think their patients are "touched by an angel" when it's the nurses themselves who seem a bit "touched." Remember, if you can't think of a real reason why men are evil or you are a victim, then just MAKE SOMETHING UP! Enjoy.

Viragos Versus Viagra

Question: If men had almost no means of contraception available to them and women had multiple methods to choose from, do you think feminists would demand equality (for men)? Or do you think feminists would find something else to complain about?

And we think you know the answer to that one.

Feminist hypocrisy is in the spotlight once again because of the publicity surrounding the new impotency drug Viagra. Feminists saw that -- horrors! -- some of our health-

care dollars were going to be spent on men. So how do they object to that? Well, they just Make Something Up.

In this case, feminists invented a strained and farfetched grievance: that some insurance companies were quick to cover Viagra while some of them do not cover contraception for women.

So here is what feminists see as unfair. Women have "the pill," diaphragms, spermicides, Norplant, and many other methods, and men do not. Half of medical plans cover "the pill," while they do not cover anything similar for men because there is nothing similar for men. Naturally, with such inequality working in **their** favor, feminists had to find something else to complain about.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America said this situation is a sign of "bias against women." That might make sense if companies were covering contraceptives for men and not for women. But when **only** women get the benefit, feminists say it's a sign of "bias against women."

Incredible!

The fact is that about half of insurance companies now cover Viagra about a month after it went on the market. About half of insurance companies also cover "the pill." The funding rates are about equal, while the conditions they cover are not.

One of the arguments feminists make in favor of more coverage of contraception is that it is a "health" issue, and as such it is of concern to all of us.

What? A few seconds ago, feminists were saying that pregnancy is a private matter, that it concerns a woman and her body and no one else. In fact, legalized abortion in the United States is based on the argument that it is a privacy right.

Which means that, according to feminists, pregnancy is a private matter of public concern that involves only a woman and her body though it also involves your money -- and the decision must be left up to the woman while the decision to have your insurance premiums funding her sexual activity is not left up to you.

Got that?

While feminists argue that pregnancy is a matter of choice, impotence is not a matter of choice. Impotence is a medical malfunction --

and the purpose of medicine is to treat medical problems. Hence the drug Viagra.

Pregnancy is not a dysfunction -- much as feminists would like to demonize the condition as oppressive to women. Pregnancy occurs not because the body is malfunctioning, but because it is working.

If pregnancy is a matter of "choice," a woman has the choice of engaging in sex and having abortions. It's just that feminists want us to foot the bill for her choice, while fighting tooth and nail over any money being spent on men.

At Per's MANifesto, we actually can see the need for providing contraceptive coverage to some women. We're not against it. We're against feminists demagoguing the issue and the newspapers playing along with them. We don't need this man-bashing, these shrill claims of "bias," these imaginary forms of victimhood.

But if feminists want to make it an issue of fairness, then maybe the rest of the world will start asking questions: If a woman chooses to engage in sex, why should we subsidize her choice and only **her** choice when we do not pay for -- or even have -- a pill or similar method for men? And who but a feminist could call this situation "bias against women"?

There are only two basic methods of birth control available for men: the condom and the vasectomy. One kills sexual sensation, the other involves surgery, cannot be casually reversed, and might be linked to higher rates of prostate cancer.

But feminists have been remarkably successful in getting the major news organizations to play along, presenting the feminist argument without and counterbalance or without pointing out the obvious flaws in it. It is amazing how many newspapers and TV news shows presented the feminist argument of "bias against women" in funding contraceptives without noting the simple, obvious fact that contraceptives aren't funded for men!

If you want to deny that the media are biased in favor of feminists, just look at this issue. Feminist accusations were given major coverage by papers, but many of these same papers did not bother pointing out the simple, obvious fact that there are no contraceptives for men and hence no insurance

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

coverage for them. It's a basic, stare-you-in-the-face fact, yet amazingly it got overlooked as the news media gave the feminists a free ride. When feminists have a complaint like this one -- even a spurious complaint -- it's treated as news. When men have legitimate grievances with anti-male discrimination in jobs, the courts, and society, it's covered under the topic of "backlash" and "sexism."

That's why Per's MANifesto has to keep on pointing out what the news media omit. We do not have the type of staffing and budget you get at major newspapers and TV news shows, but we can still see the obvious. Are major news organizations incapable of seeing the obvious? Or would they rather not rock the feminist boat?

In particular, we'd like to note a Washington Post story on the Viagra controversy that missed the obvious facts we just pointed out, while also going off on a tangent to inject some feminist propaganda. The article said: "Women of child-bearing age spend an average of 68 percent more out-of-pocket on health costs than men in the same age group, recent research has suggested." Whoa, there. "Suggested?" What does that mean? If you're not sure about a statistic, why are you putting a precise number on it and printing it? Moreover, the article never tells us what this supposed "research" is, when or where it was done or, most important, who did it. We suspect it was yet more "feminist" research. You know what that is -- the same thing that gave us phony statistics about one in four (or one in three) women being raped in their lifetimes, or a "holocaust" of anorexia victims, or five billion trillion gazillion women being victims of domestic violence every minute.

Why are the papers still using this type of spurious feminist claptrap?

And just think what is being implied by saying "Women of child-bearing age spend an average of 68 percent more out-of-pocket on health costs ..." Does that mean *women* spend the money, or that it was spent *on* women? There's a big difference, especially when there is a husband spending money on his wife's prenatal care, or the insurance policies that we all pay into paying more out to women. It looks like feminists took an advantage for women and fudged it into a

new form of victimhood. Just Make Something Up.

Also, that same paragraph goes on to say: "It is unclear how much of that disparity arises because women consume more health care, and how much occurs because insurance fails to pay for the services that women alone use."

So your research "suggested" a conclusion on which you were still "unclear."

So why are you even bothering to print it?

One final note: Feminists and their sympathizers are making a nationwide push to pass laws mandating certain levels of coverage for women's contraceptives. A half dozen states have passed such legislation. But only for women, of course.* (While feminists continue to claim this is a sign of bias *against* them.)²⁴⁰

Make Something Up

"Where are the Snowdens of yesteryear?"

Pardon us for remembering a line from the novel "Catch-22." We recalled it because of Grant Snowden, who is now a free man in Miami, Florida. But Snowden's yesteryears will never return -- not the twelve years he spent behind bars for a crime that never happened.

Grant Snowden used to be a police officer. He was once named officer of the year.

Now his plans are to go to work on a potato farm.

Snowden, now 51, was convicted in 1986 of having sexually abused two children at his wife's home day care. This was the heyday of the national hysteria over supposed "ritual abuse" and satanic worship. Many of the cases from that era have dissolved under closer examination in a less hysterical atmosphere. Today, the contaminated evidence, the leading and deceptive interview techniques used on children, the coercion of child witnesses, the "recovered memories" and "guided imagery" on which accusations were based, have been largely discredited. Among the mass abuse cases that collapsed under closer examination are the McMartin preschool case in California, the Little Ras-

* "Viagra's Success Fuels Gender Bias Debate: Birth Control Advocates Raise Issue" *The Washington Post*, 20 May 1998. Available at:
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-05/20/1451-052098-idx.html>>

cals case in North Carolina, the Margaret Kelly Michaels case in New Jersey and the Fells Acres case in Massachusetts.

In Wenatchee, Washington, a notoriously flawed prosecution of "child sex rings" has been drawing international attention and shame. Twenty-eight people were accused of ritually molesting children in a ring supposedly connected to a local church.

Every defendant who could afford a lawyer was acquitted or had the charges dismissed. But every defendant who could not afford a lawyer was convicted or pleaded guilty: That's fourteen guilty pleas and five convictions on charges that the accusers are now recanting amid evidence of serious prosecutorial abuse.

Among those in prison are Harold and Idella Everett, who now have been jailed more than three years. But a judge in Spokane recently ruled they should be allowed to withdraw their confessions and be given a new trial. Their 13-year-old daughter has withdrawn the accusation she made against them and has said she was coerced into making it by a police official.

According to the Associated Press, Superior Court Judge Wallis Friel ruled for a new trial after "questioned the objectivity of Wenatchee Police investigator Bob Perez, who was a foster parent to the Everett girls. The older girl said she told Perez and child-welfare workers that nothing happened to her but felt pressured to make her accusations. ... Critics maintained that Perez, prosecutors and obsessed social workers created a whirlpool of sexual hysteria -- coaxing children into accusations and bullying bewildered, poorly educated adults into confessions."

Back to Snowden's case. He had been sentenced to five life terms in prison. The 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta overturned his conviction.

In getting the conviction overturned, his defense team cited tainted evidence, child witnesses who were asked loaded questions, dubious medical tests, and a prosecution psychologist who used questionable techniques in trying to elicit accusations. The appeals court also noted the factor of inaccurate expert testimony, including prosecution psychologist Simon Miranda, who made the remarkable claim that "99.5 percent of

the children who report an incident of abuse are telling the truth." Actually, prosecutors in the hysteria era rarely believed children when they said no abuse occurred. They subjected the children to threatening and coercive interviews until they got the answers they wanted, then declared that children do not lie -- even though they must have been lying once if they changed their stories!

False accusations are not victimless crimes. The conviction of Grant Snowden hurt both him and his family immensely. As an Associated Press story noted: "I got my father taken away from me 12 years ago," said Grant Snowden Jr., who was placed on probation for losing his temper with the mother of one of the young accusers after his father went to prison. "We've got a lot of catching up to do."

Snowden's case is of wider interest to citizens of the U.S. The Florida attorney general who led the charge against him was none other than Janet Reno.

Yes, that's the same Janet Reno who today heads the entire U.S. Department of Justice as the nation's top law-enforcement official.

This isn't the first such witch hunt that our esteemed Ms. Reno was responsible for. The book "Satan's Silence" recounts how, in 1989, fourteen-year-old Bobby Fijnje was arrested and accused of assaulting several children. A diabetic, he was detained, denied food, and went into the first throes of insulin shock, at which point he "confessed." Reno had him jailed and cut off contact with his parents, whom she said were probably satan-worshipping pornographers.

Bobby Fijnje was acquitted of all charges.

Reno was head prosecutor in another case that took place while she was facing a serious re-election challenge. During this time, Reno grabbed onto a case involving hysteria over a daycare center in County Walk, a suburb of Miami, Florida, and rode the hysteria back into office.

The case involved Ileana Fuster, a young Honduran woman accused of kissing the bodies of babies placed in her care. Prosecutors seemed to ignore the evidence that this was a common custom in the households of many Honduran families, instead trumping the case into a sensationalized, and exaggerated, sex scandal. It really took off when they learned that Ileana's husband had a

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

prior conviction for fondling the breast of a clothed nine-year-old girl at a party.

Ileana Fuster was arrested in August of 1984 and placed in solitary confinement. Even though it was a woman who initially was accused, prosecutors decided they wanted to go after her husband -- a man apparently makes a better target when you need votes. There was no evidence -- but prosecutors knew ways to get some anyway.

Principally, they wanted Ileana to accuse her husband, but though she was terrified of jail and threats of a long prison sentence, she consistently refused. The prosecutors essentially kept her there about a year, until she broke. She was 17 years old.

The techniques they used to break her are worth noting. When Ileana consistently told them her husband had not molested any children in her care, it was decided that she had hidden memories that she had not recovered yet. Her defense attorney had ambitions of being appointed to head a multimillion dollar state program -- and it was no secret that Ms. Reno wanted convictions in this case. So her own defense attorney had Ileana subjected to various forms of mind-altering techniques -- so-called "visualization" exercises in which she was told to picture sex crimes occurring -- while at the same time being told that a deal could be cut to get her a light sentence!

Experts who have examined the records of these and other sessions say the techniques are much like brainwashing and hypnosis. Ileana was so strung out after these sessions that once she did not recognize her own mother who had come to visit.

Her "therapist" told her she could not remember the supposed sex crimes because she was having "blackouts." When she had nightmares in this nightmarish setting, she was told that they were "memories" that were emerging.

Under this pressure, the girl cracked. She signed a confession of sex crimes while declaring she still could not consciously remember them! Janet Reno came to court and held Ileana's hand while she confessed. It was the least she could do for someone helping her win an election.

As part of the deal, Ileana had to accuse her husband, Frank, of a wild array of ritualized sex abuses, including putting snakes in

children's bodies -- the types of bizarre accusations seen in other hysteria cases such as McMartin Preschool.

Ileana served three and a half years in a juvenile facility and was deported to Honduras. Her husband, Frank, was sentenced to six life terms, plus 165 years. He is still in prison.

Prosecutors admitted they probably wouldn't have been able to convict him without Ileana's confession.

And once in Honduras, out from under the threats and brainwashing of Janet Reno's justice system, Ileana retracted everything.*

The County Walk case was never brought up by anyone when Janet Reno went before Senate hearings to become attorney general of the United States. But supporters cited her concern for children.²⁴¹

Bravo, Mark

Mark Bravo has a law degree today.

Contrary to what feminists say, Mark didn't get his degree by exercising some sort of "male privilege" or because he had some sort of advantage in being male. Just the opposite. Mark Bravo earned a law degree after being sent to prison on a false rape charge. His "male privilege" consisted of the "privilege" of being sent to prison based solely on the word of one woman.

The case was truly amazing. He was a nurse at Metropolitan State Hospital in Norwalk, California, in October 1990 when he was accused. He had an alibi. Other employees backed up his version. And the woman who accused him was a mental patient. What's more, she claimed a "Tony Bravo" had raped her. Despite all the evidence of his innocence, the system railroaded him. He was sentenced to eight years in prison. It shows once again that feminism is a much more powerful force than justice.

We know what feminists will say: that women don't lie about such things. But, in fact, the woman admitted she lied. She eventually recanted her story and said someone else attacked her. A Los Angeles Superior

* Catherine Wilson, "Ex-police officer free after child-abuse conviction thrown out," *Associated Press*, n.d.; John K. Wiley, "Judge recommends new trial for couple in sex ring case," *Associated Press*, n.d.; Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker, *Satan's Silence*, (New York: Basic Books, 1995.)

Court judge ordered new DNA tests, which showed Bravo was innocent. He was freed in 1994.

One of the incredible things about this case is that Bravo had appealed his conviction all the way to the California Supreme Court, and at each level the system rejected his arguments. The word of a woman mental patient was held in greater esteem than that of an innocent man with an alibi! It wasn't just the accuser who was crazy -- it was the entire system.

Once he was free, Mark set out to earn a law degree. Bravo, now 29, graduated this month from Western State University College of Law. He also has been awarded \$3.9 million in damages in a civil rights lawsuit. A Los Angeles Superior Court found that investigators in his original case "deliberately and with malice," deprived Bravo of his rights.

We wonder: what was the agenda of those prosecutors? Was Mark Bravo nothing more to them than another notch on their guns? Were they of a feminist bent, prejudiced against men, or were they merely afraid of the feminist lobby? Did they think that sending innocent men to prison is going to somehow help them "take back the night"?

As usual, the false-accuser's name is not being released. Her identity is being protected, and she is not facing any charges. Of course feminists will say "How could you hold a mentally unstable woman responsible for her actions?" But she was considered responsible enough to send a man to prison based solely on her word.

Whatever their motives, we have to remember that false accusations are not victimless crimes. They destroy innocent people.

We have seen some feminists who have been remarkable callous toward falsely accused men. These feminists shrug and say that the men aren't really hurt much by such accusations.

But Mark Bravo has a family, too. He has children, whose father was taken away from them. Though the children always believed in the goodness and innocence of their father, they still had to live with the cruel stigma of having a father in prison on a rape charge. And they missed their father's love

and guidance all those years he was in prison.

Somehow we would feel better if just one major feminist or just one major feminist organization expressed some regret over innocent men who are falsely accused. But we've seen precious little remorse or regret from them. Instead, they dig in their heels despite all the cases like Mark Bravo's, and insist that false accusations either never happen or are not a big problem when they do.

Well, we suppose that depends on whether it's you or someone you love sitting in a prison cell, disgraced for life. Then it no longer looks like a minor problem anymore.*

Feminist denial of false accusations is like the Titanic Syndrome all over again: you can always sacrifice men to protect the lives of women.²⁴²

Phil Hartman Will Not be Remembered

Actor-comedian Phil Hartman will be remembered for his skillful impressions, his long run on the TV show "Saturday Night Live," his contributions to projects ranging from Pee-wee Herman shows to "The Simpsons" and an impressive array of movies and television projects.

But mark our words: Phil Hartman will not be remembered when the topic turns to domestic violence.

Phil was killed by his wife, who then turned the gun on herself. By definition, it ought to be an obvious example of domestic violence. The problem, however, is that feminists have succeeded in re-defining domestic violence as something that only men do, with women the only victims. And the news media have fallen in line. Whenever the news media cover domestic violence issues, it almost certainly will involve feminists talking of violence by men. There are many other forms of domestic violence -- women abusing children, women abusing women, and women abusing men -- but feminists have worked miracles in making these disappear from coverage of domestic violence.

* Martha Bellisle, "Wrongfully Jailed Man Earns Degree," *Associated Press*, Sunday, May 24, 1998. Available at: <<http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WAPO/19980524/V000174-052498-idx.html>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

In the October 1977 issue of MANifesto, we told you about the staged propaganda event in Washington, D.C., on November 22. The organizers put up 1,500 life-sized wooden figures of women murdered by domestic abusers. Women and only women. This type of event is staged quite often -- with some symbol standing in for the victims -- and the only victims represented are women. You can bet when feminists stage the next such propaganda rally on domestic violence, there will be no mention of Phil Hartman, or of any man killed by a female acquaintance. He will not be remembered.

That is quite remarkable, because men make up about 40 percent of spouses killed in domestic violence, according to Justice Department figures. The feminist reaction to this is that it must have been self defense, the men must have deserved it. Male equals guilty.

Now there is before the public a clear-cut case showing what researchers have always known: there are violent women, and they kill men for a lot of other reasons besides self defense. In 1977, Suzanne Steinmetz released results from several studies showing that the percentage of wives who have used physical violence is higher than the percentage of husbands, and that the wives' average violence score tended to be higher, although men were somewhat more likely to cause greater injury. She also found that women were as likely as men to initiate physical violence. Of every 100 families, 3.8 experience severe husband-to-wife violence, but 4.5% experience severe wife-to-husband violence. (Straus, Gelles, Steinmetz, "Behind Closed Doors: Violence in American Families," 1980).

Brynn Hartman, the wife who killed Phil Hartman, was not acting in self defense. Phil Hartman was shot multiple times, in bed, apparently while sleeping. Early reports indicate is body did not even show defensive wounds that would indicate he was awake and knew a gun was aimed at him.

Friends and acquaintances say that Brynn Hartman was a troubled woman and a drug abuser. Early in life, she had wanted to be a model or actress, but obviously that career never went anywhere. So she married a successful comedian and latched onto the good life that way. But friends say she had a

violent temper and a violent streak, and at times Hartman would have to restrain her violent attacks. He was doing a sensible thing -- getting ready to leave her -- when she killed him. The picture emerges of a woman who couldn't control her violence, and couldn't take responsibility for it. If he left her, she might have gotten a fat financial settlement, but she would be a nobody while her ex would continue on a successful career. Perhaps she just couldn't stand that thought.

Who knows? Feminists might still try to turn Brynn Hartman into a heroine or a victim the way they did with Betty Broderick, the abusive, narcissistic woman who murdered her ex-husband and his new wife in a jealous rage. Ms. Broderick attracted a great deal of sympathetic responses from feminist defenders, showing just how many women are amenable to the use of violence when it suits *their* moods and outlooks. Feminists might just Make Something Up -- and blame Phil Hartman for his death -- saying he deserved it for "deserting" his wife. Bullhockey. No man should stay with an abusive woman. Brynn Hartman's ultimate violence showed how right he was to decide to leave her.²⁴³

Equality: All Washed Up

Here is one of the most incredible stories out of feminism that we've heard in a long time. At first we thought it was a joke, but we checked the Electronic Telegraph, web site by the publishers of England's Daily and Sunday Telegraph, and the story was there.

In Austria, a committee of the Parliament has voted that the country should legally require men to do at least half the housework, as part of a campaign to reduce Austria's rising divorce rate.

As the Electronic Telegraph article states: "The nationwide campaign to change the old divorce laws was started two years ago by Austria's Women's Ministry. Its Halb Halb (half half) campaign argued that not only housework but other aspects of marriage, such as care of the children, should be divided on a 50-50 basis, with allowances for partners who work or have other commitments."

The article also states: "The new laws, which were recently approved by an all-

party parliamentary select committee, are part of a radical shake-up of marriage and divorce legislation that dates from Adolf Hitler's annexation of Austria in 1938. The Nazi view that women should content themselves with Kinder, Kuche, Kirche, (children, kitchen and church), is, not surprisingly, unpopular with modern Austrian women." The policy has been promoted by a publicity campaign costing about two million British pounds.

Watch how one feminist jumps through hoops to defend this governmental mandate of private matters. Sonja Kato, a spokeswoman for the Austrian Women's Ministry, said: "Partnership in marriage is something private, but the state is a community of private people."

Another supporter is Terezilja Stolsits, the legal spokesperson for the Green Party. Ms. Stolsits also denies that the law involves the government intruding into domestic affairs.

We certainly love feminist logic: a law involving domestic affairs does not involve domestic affairs.

Feminists who object to "Kinder, Kuche, Kirche" on the grounds that is was a governmental intrusion into private lives now want to intrude into private lives with a law of their own. Remember, with feminism, nothing is ever right or wrong. It's merely right if feminists do it, and wrong if anyone else does. As we say at Per's MANifesto, Sieg Her!

Others are planning to cash in. "Walter Penk-Lipovsky, who has run his own private detective agency in Vienna for 30 years, said he had already planned how to monitor how much a husband was doing around the house." Clearly the law is going to supply lots of money to lawyers and private-eyes.

All this caused us to reflect that, after its defeat in World War I, Austria was transformed from a monarchy to a republic, and both men and women had the right to vote. Since the female population was undoubtedly higher than the male population -- considering the men who died in the war -- that means that the majority of the Austria electorate was female. And sentiment was high for union with Germany, even after the rise of Hitler. Despite feminist poses of purity, it's a fact of history that women adored Hitler. He was a charismatic man of power.

At parades and rallies, women would sometimes swoon when he drew near.

So now modern Austrian women are protesting the modern state of affairs, without, of course, taking any responsibility for them. Oh, we know what feminists will say -- that women could not possibly have supported the "Kinder, Kuche, Kirche" policies because it turned out so badly for them. Using that logic, we could argue that Austria could not possibly have wanted union with Germany because it turned out so badly for them. And, of course, no one could have supported Hitler.

One thing about "Kinder, Kuche, Kirche" policies is that it was sending women to kitchens and nurseries at a time when men were being sent to combat zones, graveyards, and amputee wards. And leading up to these events there had been a majority-female population, armed with the vote. It's both hilarious and sad that women could have voted the kitchen for themselves and the death-trenches for men and still claim to be the victims.

But while we're at it, let's write a bill that truly divides up the work around the house fifty-fifty.

That means that Austrian women will have to do half the snow-shoveling.

They will have to get up at night in investigate half the noises heard downstairs.

They will have to do half the yard work, including hauling half the bags of clippings, trimmings, etc.

Austrian women will have to change half of all flat tires.

They will have to go fetch the car half of the time when it's pouring down rain.

They will have to pick up the check fifty percent of the time.

They will have to handle half the burglars who break into the house.

They will have to fix half the stopped toilets, flooded basements, broken sump pumps, and backed-up sewer lines.

Austrian women will have to dish out half the reassurances about their partner's weight, hip size, clothing, and new hairdos.

Austrian women will have to buy half the flowers purchased in the household to make up for offenses they're not quite sure how or when or if they committed.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

But let's not stop there. While we're at it, let's demand that Austrian men really do half the work in the household -- including the complaining. And men will have to do half the pouting when their partners fail to read their minds. Women will have to give half the diamonds and jewelry. Men will have to own half the clothes and shoes.

And if men are expected to do half the work caring for children, we should expect that men get custody half the time in custody disputes.

This still doesn't cover the women who never lift a finger around the house. If a woman has maids and servants doing the work for her, we should require that she gets a job and pays at least half the salary of those employees.

In some households there are who just plain don't do housework. The new law should be a boon for their husbands and children. We can't wait until the law forces these women to do half the work.*

Of course we can already hear feminists screaming in outrage over this. They will say that it is forcing women into a traditional gender role.²⁴⁴

Touch Touche

Witchcraft is alive and well and living in our hospitals and universities. We're talking about the practice of "therapeutic touch," which has caught on with many in the healing profession, most of them women.

The "therapeutic touch" people believe that an energy field emanates from each person and can be manipulated to help heal them. This field supposedly can be detected as a sensation of hot or cold just above the skin of the patient. The healer moves her hands over the patient's body, without touching the patient, to holistically realign this invisible field and make nice.

According to the Journal of the American Medical Association and the Associated Press, more than 100,000 people worldwide have been taught the technique, including at least 43,000 health-care professionals. It is

practiced in at least 80 North American hospitals and taught in more than 100 colleges and universities in 75 countries. It has been used to help conditions from premenstrual syndrome, headaches, burns and bone fractures to asthma, reproductive problems, cancer and AIDS.

The concept is so absurd that a child could see through it.

In fact, a child did.

Nine-year-old Emily Rosa conducted a study as a science project showing that 21 experienced "touch" practitioners couldn't even find the field they were supposedly manipulating. Her study passed review and was included in the March 25 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

The Associated Press reported: "Emily set up a cardboard screen through which practitioners put their hands. With their sight blocked, she asked them to identify which of their hands was near one of hers. The 21 practitioners chose the correct hand 44 percent of the time. That was slightly less than the 50 percent chance they would have had of choosing the correct hand by guessing."

But the supporters of therapeutic touch aren't going to let science get in the way of what they "know" is true. Dolores Krieger, professor emeritus of nursing science at New York University and co-founder of therapeutic touch in 1972, quickly labeled Emily's study as invalid. Ms. Krieger claims that therapeutic touch has been back up by numerous doctoral dissertations and "innumerable" clinical studies. She herself has written two books about it.

It's best to know your terms when you're dealing with folks like Ms. Krieger. "Clinical studies" are differentiated from laboratory studies done under rigidly controlled, scientific conditions. "Clinical studies," on the other hand, got their name because they are done out in the field -- often in clinics -- under unscientific and subjective conditions. Often a clinical study simply involves a therapist making observations and drawing subjective conclusions that cannot be tested. They might be right, they might be wrong -- and another "clinical researcher" observing the same things might draw the opposite conclusion. With laboratory studies, one of the most important aspects is that someone

* Michael Leidig, "Austrian husbands must do washing up by law," *The Telegraph*, 22 February 1998. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/et?ac=000502331060165&rtm=0-a3bReeXL&atmo=99999999&P4%5FFOLLOW%5FON=%2F98%2F%2F22%2Fwcho22%2Ehtml&pg=/et/98/2/2/wcho22.html>

else using your methods could produce the exact same results. With clinical studies, the results are often subjective -- an "art form," if you will. Clinical studies have given us all sorts of techniques ranging from "recovered memory therapy," investigations of "past lives," memories of "satanic cults," and so on.

We think that practitioners of therapeutic touch like Ms. Krieger might have good intentions. We wonder if they can use their uncanny powers, then, to detect the pavement on the Road to Hell.²⁴⁵

Sieg Her!

Maybe you've heard the feminist propaganda about how wonderful the world will be when women are in charge. As leaders, women are much more caring and nurturing -- so the argument goes.

Well, there's a woman in charge in the town of Cicero, Illinois, and she's demonstrating once again how equal men and women are.

Town President Betty Loren-Maltese recently fired eight police officers. She cited several supposed reasons for this action, including that some of the officers did not live within the Cicero limits, as required. But why was she suddenly enforcing those rules now?

Well, it might have something to do with the fact that one of the officers, Lt. Charles Hernandez, ran against her for the position of town president. And the seven others? Six of them supported Hernandez, and the last one refused to support Ms. Loren-Maltese.

And then Ms. Loren-Maltese purges them from the force. Of course it has *nothing* to do with them challenging her in a fair and open election.

We're glad Cicero has a caring and nurturing town president. If it had been some man, he probably would have tried to stifle dissent. You know how patriarchal men are.[†]

Meanwhile, an independent counsel has been appointed to investigate charges that U.S. Labor Secretary Alexis M. Herman "solicited illegal campaign contributions and

engaged in influence peddling while a White House aide." Isn't it great that we're getting rid of corrupt men in favor of such people as Alexis Herman?[‡]

We've said it before and we'll say it again: women really are equal to men. Let's stop the man-bashing involved in claiming that women are somehow more honest or are more moral as leaders. When women say they should be elected because they're women, then they're running on a stereotype rather than their individual merits. And that's probably because they don't have many individual merits.

Which leads us to Geraldine Ferraro...²⁴⁶

You're So Inane

Geraldine A. Ferraro was the first woman nominated by a major U.S. political party to run for the vice presidency. Ferraro was picked to be Walter Mondale's running mate in their failed White House bid because of her gender. And her career has followed the fault lines of gender politics ever since.

Now she's running for office again, in New York state. She's seeking the Democratic nomination to run against wily Republican senator Alfonse M. D'Amato. And, predictably, Ferraro is playing the gender card.

She's already in a tough primary race and might not even win the nomination to face D'Amato. But any way you slice it, we are guaranteed to see more divisive, feminist demagoguery out of Ferraro.

Ferraro accused D'Amato of sponsoring a measure she calls a "drive-by mastectomy bill" that, she says, would victimize women to benefit the insurance industry. D'Amato's bill is actually in response to women who say they've been forced to leave hospitals within hours of having a mastectomy. His bill stipulates that the length of time a woman stays in the hospital after the procedure would be determined by her in consultation with her physician.

That's not good enough for Ferraro -- at least not when she's out seeking votes and playing sexual politics. She's trying to paint

* Brenda C. Coleman, "Fourth-grade science project casts doubt on 'therapeutic touch,'" *Associated Press*, n.d.

† "Eight ousted Cicero cops sue over alleged political purge," *The Associated Press*, May 20, 1998.

‡ *The Washington Post*, 27 May 1998. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-05/27/0631-052798-idx.html>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

her opponent -- a man -- as a heartless brute who is selling out women.

The problem is, Ferraro has nothing similar to say about D'Amato's co-sponsor on the bill -- who is none other than ultra-liberal, feminist Senator Dianne Feinstein of California. Apparently only the man's motives were suspect in sponsoring this bill.

To make Ferraro's sexual politics all the more absurd, virtually every major breast-cancer organization has lined up behind D'Amato on this issue. The American Cancer Society and the National Breast Cancer Coalition praised D'Amato for his help in drafting the bill. Both groups say it's not good policy to create a federal law mandating how long women should be kept in the hospital for a specific procedure.

Ferraro, on the other hand, is demanding a mandatory minimum 48-hour hospital stay for women following a mastectomy. Like most feminists, the thought that women might actually be strong enough to leave earlier does not seem to have occurred to her. Like most feminists, she tells women they are weak and then plays on their fears.

But we have to remember that there are a limited number of hospital beds. When you start requiring mandatory minimums for certain "popular" conditions that have a certain amount of political momentum behind them, what happens to people who have more serious conditions but less clout? Does a woman with a mastectomy really deserve to hold that bed longer than a woman with a stroke or heart attack? Or longer than a man with pancreatic cancer?²⁴⁷

We'd like to mandate a hospital stay for Ms. Ferraro -- provided she can find a surgeon who can take out her sexual demagoguery.

And in related news, singer/songwriter Carly Simon recently was diagnosed with a malignant tumor in her breast and had it removed. Her prognosis is, fortunately, very good.

Unfortunately, she decided to grab some publicity from it while also making some very stupid remarks. She said of breast cancer:

"We need a lot more money for research. There's a feeling that if this had been a man's disease it would have been licked already."

Carly is in perfect keeping with the theme of this issue: "Make Something Up." If Ms. Simon had thought for a moment -- an iffy proposition with many pop stars -- she would have realized that neither testicular cancer nor prostate cancer "have been licked already." And these are men's diseases.

We checked the American Cancer Society's web site,²⁴⁸ ... and found that "The American Cancer Society estimates that in 1998 about 184,500 new cases of prostate cancer will be diagnosed and 39,200 men will die of this disease in the United States." Well, Carly, that's not exactly cured, is it? If you can shake your self-absorption for a moment, just think how this might affect you. If those men had lived, some of them might have bought your CDs. Now do you grasp the tragedy?

And while about the same number of men die from prostate cancer as women who die from breast cancer, the funding for breast cancer research is about 600 percent greater -- and public awareness campaigns, news coverage, and political activity on breast cancer are similarly much greater. It continues to be so much greater because people like Simon would rather cry "victim" than look at reality.

Ms. Simon's comments fit perfectly with our modern feminist era -- when you don't need logic, truth, intelligence, or the simplest powers of observation to claim to be a victim of sexism. Just ignore reality and Make Something Up.²⁴⁹

Logic, Carly. Lots of people do it better.²⁵⁰

Quotable

The late Bella Abzug, a very vocal feminist, once said the following:

"I am not elevating women to sainthood, nor am I suggesting that all women are good and all men are bad. Women have screamed for war. Women, like men, have stoned black children going to integrated schools. ... Some women. They, of course, have a right to vote and a right to run for office. I will defend that right, but I will not support them or vote for them."²⁵¹

JUNE 1998

WELCOME, READERS: We supposed feminists could accuse Per's MANifesto of being "afraid of commitment," at least as far as deadlines are concerned. Yep, we're running a bit late getting the July issue to you, but it's a good issue for all that. Sometimes we wish we were feminists so we could blame it all on the patriarchy or something. At any rate, our theme this month is "AND JUSTICE FOR SOME," which refers, of course, to the feminist approach to justice. After you've studied feminism for a while, you notice that feminism's has been working to lower or abolish responsibilities for women while increasing or creating new responsibilities for men. It is not a rule of law, it is a rule of expediency, with feminism's moral principles involving whatever seems to benefit them at the moment. That is why the feminist approach always ends up as a matter of "Justice for Some."

Justice for Me and Not for Thee

A few months ago there were several divorce cases in the news involving women married to rich men. The women were seeking huge divorce settlements under the argument that, as wives, they were entitled to at least half of everything their husbands owned. Even if the women had nothing to do with how their husbands made a fortune, they still felt entitled. They were married, so everything is fifty-fifty.

If you were within earshot of feminists at that time, you remember how vehemently they argued in favor of those huge divorce settlements, even for women who never lifted a finger during their marriages. The arguments ran the gamut, usually involving the concept that women contribute equally to the marital union. It was never quite clear how an idle socialite who marries a man who had already made his fortune really contributes to their wealth by ordering the servants about. But the feminists were adamant: women share equally in marriage.

But it's funny to notice how quickly feminists change their (ahem) moral principles when the husband has debts or obligations instead of assets. Just as you might expect, feminists who argue that women married to rich men have everything to do with their husbands' fortunes suddenly begin arguing

that wives have nothing to do with their husbands' misfortunes.

Case in point is the current legislative effort to exempt women from collections by the Internal Revenue Service, the tax-gathering and tax-enforcement agency of the United States. Under a legal concept called "joint and several liability" the IRS can seek back-taxes from one spouse if the other is unavailable. When a husband and wife sign a joint tax return, they are both considered equally responsible for the truth and accuracy of the return, and both are held responsible for any debts and penalties that may occur.

Unless they are women. In which case they are what some folks refer to as "innocent spouses." Special exemptions for "innocent spouses" have already been included in a bill approved by the House of Representatives. Now Congresswoman Nancy Johnson, a Connecticut Republican, is offering an additional bill to increase the special exemptions.

Feminists will protest that any such law will be "gender neutral." We feel that the language might be gender neutral, but the enforcement certainly will not be. The laws pushed through by feminists generally have to be couched in gender-neutral language, but feminists then take great pains to underscore that these laws are intended to protect or exempt women. The classic example is the "Violence Against Women Act." Feminists claim the language is gender neutral. Then why the title?

In fact, in the hearings, the testimony and in the partisan studies used to support the "Violence Against Women Act," feminists portrayed women solely as the victims of violence, not the perpetrators, and they portray men as the violent ones. Though women commit a major share of domestic violence, feminists made sure that everyone got the message that the "Violence Against Women Act" was a measure to protect women, not prosecute them, and to prosecute men, not protect them. Sure they can say the language often seems gender neutral. But then feminists and their supporters get to instruct our legal and law-enforcement agencies in how they are supposed to apply the "Violence Against Women Act." There is nothing "gender neutral" about that train-

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

ing. By ignoring and denying violence by women against men, they send the clear signal that this law is meant to protect only women. And because they are often doing this in an official capacity, acting as representatives of the government, they convey the unmistakable message that the government is fully behind this bias.

The same is happening with the "innocent spouses" laws. The Congressional hearings have featured women claiming to be innocent spouses. Men are significantly absent. If you plant the idea throughout the legal system that "innocent spouse" means female, you can make the language as supposedly neutral as you want and still be assured of the desired, biased results.

The same happened with sexual harassment laws. Feminists can claim that these were written in "gender neutral" language. But feminists had so inculcated the idea that harassment was something men do to women that the U.S. legal system was unsure until recently whether the laws even protect men.

Courts repeatedly rejected the idea that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 offers men protection from same-sex harassment. Finally a case, *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services, Inc.*, went to the Supreme Court, which decided unanimously in March that men also are protected from harassment under this law. It took the highest court in the land and a protracted legal struggle to determine that a "gender neutral" law also protects men!

Such "gender-neutral" language is a smoke screen. Feminists from the start made a determined effort to frame the issue in terms of women-only victimhood -- from their biased studies to the popular books and movies that offered only one view of the issue. It's no wonder the legal system could not interpret a "gender neutral" law in a gender neutral manner. After years of feminist rhetoric, press releases, and made-for-TV movies, the legal system assumed the law was intended to protect only women. This is just the type of bias feminists are aiming for.

In fact, the bias showed itself quite starkly -- and perhaps unintentionally -- in a recent Washington Post story on "innocent spouses." The Post wrote: "Johnson's proposal

would let spouses assign 'primary and secondary liability for collection' in tax disputes. That would essentially direct the IRS to pursue a husband first ..."

Got that? "The husband first." The Post, like everyone at these hearings, has already gotten the message that the "innocent spouse" is the woman and the one you have to go after is the man.

In divorce, our system assumes that wives are entitled to half of all assets while exempting them from responsibilities. The irony of this current debate is that there might be both assets and bad debts involved. The ex-wives can claim they are entitled to half the assets while being exempt from the debts as "innocent spouses."

More and more, feminism is a movement to put women on the pedestal in much the same manner as in the olden days. Women are portrayed as innocent, nurturing, and virtuous. If her husband made a fortune, it must be because she stood behind him through the lean years. If the husband cheated on his taxes, the wife must have known nothing about it -- and heaven forbid we think that she might have urged him to do it. She is involved in everything good and nothing evil. She is woman.

But the sly, cunning, calculated manner in which feminists go about implanting this image speaks volumes on how they are anything but nurturing and innocent.*

Oh, and by the way -- NOW and several feminist organizations recently announced they were considering the idea of reviving that exemplar of gender-neutral language, the "Equal Rights Amendment."²⁵²

Justice for Lassies, Nae for Laddies

Scotland serves as a prime example of the concept of "Justice for Some." The Scottish Office home affairs minister, Henry McLeish, is vowing to abolish the jailing of any woman under 18 by the year 2000. Apparently, the jailing of boys will continue to be considered just fine.

Mr. McLeish says: "I stand by this Government's radical policies to ... end the imprisonment of young women, and to take a

* Rob Wells, "House moving to boost innocent spouse protections," *Associated Press*, March 18, 1998.

radical new approach to the punishment of women offenders."

The imprisonment of young men, of course, will go on as usual. Perhaps this is Mr. McLeish's rather Darwinian method of reducing competition when the ladies are about.

This sexist policy is receiving wide support. The Scotsman newspaper said in an editorial: "When Henry McLeish outlined his plans to ensure that no woman under the age of 18 should be imprisoned in Scotland, he was not mouthing pious platitudes. He was showing a rare example of enlightened thinking."

"Enlightened thinking" apparently does not extend to the humane treatment of boys, who will continue to be shuttled off to hard time that only turns out hardened offenders.

Some people will argue that males need firmer, harsher punishment. So they inflict the harshest possible punishment on boys, while sending young women to treatment programs or probation officers. Then, when men turn violent under the harshest conditions, they blame the men and cite it as evidence they were right in treating boys harshly. They never seem to stop and reflect that maybe their tendency to brutalize boys is somehow connected with the behavior of men.

The move to give lighter treatment to females while keeping harsher treatment of males is being sparked in part by the recent case of a drug peddler who was sent to prison for trying to sell drugs to children. You might ask, isn't that the usual treatment for drug sellers? Sure, but in this case the drug seller is female and pregnant. So the same offense is not deemed as worthy of punishment as it would be if the drugs were sold by a male. Apparently that means the damage done by selling drugs to children isn't as severe when the pusher is pregnant. (Such logic makes you wonder just who is doing the drugs.)

The case involves Angela Harkins, a 17-year-old bakery worker who tried to sell five tablets of ecstasy and 10 wraps of amphetamine at the Tunnel disco in Glasgow. At least two of the patrons she was trying to sell drugs to were as young as 14.

However, it turned out that her supplier had not given her the real article. She

thought she was selling drugs, but the substance turned out to be cold medicine.

The sentencing guidelines called for prison, but the public outcry has been severe, especially following the suicides of several young women in prison. The proposed solution is to just stop jailing young women. The suicides or rapes of young men in prison never seem to lead to a similar concern for their well-being.

One thing notable about this case is the effort to minimize her motives for selling drugs. Harkins' lawyer kept referring to her as "this silly young girl" and "a silly wee girl." If he had said this about the same woman while she was, say, running for public office, he probably would have been blasted by feminists for stereotyping females as mentally inferior. But when you're trying to get a female off the hook for her own behavior, you can always portray her as mentally inferior and no feminists object. In fact, they might even join you.

The Scotsman also joined in this chorus, saying of Harkins: "This 17-year-old girl committed a crime which owed more to foolishness than to evil intent." We're not sure how The Scotsman developed mind-reading powers to determine another person's intent. Perhaps the ability to read minds is not as important as the ability to notice gender. If the gender is female, the intent is not evil.

If this case had involved a boy instead of a pregnant girl, we can imagine how words like "silly" and "foolishness" would have been replaced by words like "scum" and "predator." And the suicides of men in prison would be chalked up to them getting "what they deserved."²⁵³

Some Good Nudes and Some Bad Nudes

At Long Trail School in Dorset, Vermont, 18-year-old Kate Logan decided to do something different at her graduation ceremony. She didn't just toss her mortarboard. She tossed off all her clothes.

Logan stepped to the front of the graduation podium on June 13 and started to give a speech. She then took off her cap and shed

²⁵³ Jenny Booth and Graeme Stewart, "Outcry as pregnant teenager is jailed: McLeish urged to intervene as first-time offender sent to Cornton Vale," *The Scotsman*, n.d. Available at: <<http://www.scotsman.com/index.html>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

her gown, standing naked before the stunned audience of 200. She spoke of "feeling the limitless directions, to open myself completely, to express myself fully as a confident individual -- for it is only then, which I am open and free, that truth and wisdom will reveal themselves."

Well, Katie, the truth is, most folks keep their knickers on at graduation. And if you see what most folks look like undressed, you understand the wisdom of doing so.

We mention Logan's stunt primarily so we can bring up an incident in Seattle only one week later. Two bicyclists were arrested for pedalling along nude during a summer solstice parade. It seems that "streaking" on bicycles has become a regular part of this event in recent years.

Both bicyclists charged are men.

No charges were ever filed against Kate Logan.²⁵⁴

Life or Choice?

An Oregon woman who gave birth to a stillborn baby is suing two male doctors for \$160 million in Multnomah Circuit Court, saying they missed the fact that she was pregnant. Karien Richmond, who is 18, is claiming malpractice, wrongful death and reckless infliction of emotional distress. The doctors say she told them nothing that would indicate pregnancy, and as a 180-pound teenager, her appearance did not differ from previous visits.

The wrongful death aspect of this suit is interesting. All along we've heard feminists tell us that a fetus is not a life, it's a choice. If it's not a life, how can you sue for wrongful death?

The answer lies in the "her body, her choice" mantra of feminists. If this young woman had sought to have a partial birth abortion, the fetus is part of her body. If the blame is shifted to two male doctors, the exact same fetus becomes a life.

If the woman wishes to terminate that fetus, it's a right. If she wants to sue someone else for bringing about a similar result, it's a life.

Put another way: the woman has rights, the men have responsibilities.

We have enormous sympathy for this young woman. It sounds like a horrible

ordeal. But let's not let horrible experience create horrible case law.

Don't get us wrong. We know that doctors have to be held to high standards, and missing a pregnancy would be serious, if it happened. But that's a separate issue from how the nature of a fetus should change so quickly and disturbingly, depending on the gender of the person being held responsible for it. Here again is "Justice For Some." Justice for her is a right to terminate the fetus. Justice for men is punishment if they allegedly and accidentally contribute to a similar outcome.

We wonder if she will win this suit. Remember, she's asking for \$160 million. If she gets that, the money has to come from somewhere. And that means higher insurance and medical costs for the rest of us.

The irony is that any woman who won a suit like this could use that money to have an endless string of abortions, and it would never be considered a life.²⁵⁵

Nanny News

Louise Woodward is the British woman who came to the United States to work as a nanny and became an international heroine by killing a baby boy. People the world over, and especially in her native Britain, could not believe a female was capable of violence in the home. But even as she arrives in Britain scot-free, additional evidence of her guilt is emerging.

People who were eager to engage in denial about female violence went looking for the tiniest, weakest hooks of speculation on which to hang their unconvincing arguments in favor of her innocence. Her legal defense team concocted a theory that the boy she killed, eight-month-old Matthew Eappen, actually died of an earlier injury that was probably inflicted by his parents. In doing so, Woodward inflicted a double wound on the parents -- not just killing their child, but trying to pin on them the blame that was solely hers.

Woodward got out of prison on a wrist-slap sentence and is now back in England. The tepid response to her there might indicate that many of her adoring fans are getting over their denial and realizing that they have been cheering, praying, and weeping for a woman with blood on her hands.

Woodward's contention was that Matthew died of a head injury that occurred several weeks prior to his death, and that this injury somehow failed to produce any symptoms for several weeks, and that it mysteriously started to re-bleed just when she was alone with the boy. But the June 18 issue of the New England Journal of Medicine examined similar infant deaths and found no evidence that a head wound can lay dormant like this for several weeks in a lucid child and then spring up all at once and kill.

Four University of Pennsylvania researchers wrote that, when children have severe head injuries, "there is no evidence of a prolonged interval of lucidity between the injury and the onset of symptoms. ... Thus an alert, well-appearing child has not already sustained a devastating acute injury that will become clinically obvious hours to days later." An Associated Press report notes that the Woodward case was not mentioned in the study, though it helped intensify the debate over shaken and abused babies.

The Woodward case was another example of "Justice for Some." It underscores the unwritten rule that people who are killed by women are second-class citizens, that they and their loved ones are not deserving of full justice because the crime is either disbelieved or is not seen as being as "bad." When we hide behind our illusions of female purity, we forget the reality. And in the Woodward case, the reality is this: eight-month-old Matthew Eappen was slammed down so hard the force was the same as if he had been thrown from a second story window.

What it also means is that when women commit abuse, you are going to face so much sympathy for the abuser and so much denial of the crime that you'd better have iron-clad proof. It helps if you get it on tape, so that the people who say that women are never violent will be shaken out of their illusions. That happened recently in Morristown, New Jersey, when a nanny was suspected of abusing a five-month-old baby girl in her care. The parents had noticed unexplained bruises on the girl, so they hired a firm called "Babywatch," which installed a camera disguised as part of an air filtration system in the family room.

The camera caught Siobhan Diaz of Randolph, New Jersey, repeatedly abusing the

girl: striking her in the head with the palm of her hand, twisting the child's knee, stuffing a blanket into the baby's mouth, and yelling profanities.

At her trial, Diaz cried a bit and said: "I say I'm sorry to everyone involved. I never intended to hurt anyone."

Hint: If you don't intend to hurt people, don't beat them.

Diaz was sentenced to four years in prison for child endangerment.

Sometimes there is justice.²⁵⁶

Fred Dever Defense Fund

We just learned the address for sending donations to the Fred Dever defense fund.*

Send donations to

Fred Dever Sr.

4466 Forest Trail

Cincinnati, OH 45244-1524²⁵⁷

Justice Down the Tube

In the United Kingdom, London Underground train driver Susan Edwards won a landmark case on "gender bias" because she is a single mother. She said she was forced to quit because her new shift made it impossible for her to care for her son.

So you might be saying that it's a good thing that she won the case, that we should make it easier for working parents.

But this case was not decided on the basis of what's good or fair for working parents. Parents come in two flavors -- male and female. This decision was decided based on what was good for mothers only. As the BBC News reported: "Three appeal judges unanimously ruled that the new shift system amounted to sexual discrimination because it had a far greater impact on women employees than their male colleagues."

We wonder how the judges came up with the idea that it's easier to hold a job and be a single father. First you take all the social services and cultural support for women. Then add the general disrespect and contempt directed toward dads these days. On top of that, add the fact that courts are heavily biased in favor of awarding custody to women in the first place. Then you rule that anything that interferes with this over-

* See the April 1998 issue of MANifesto for details on his case, at: <<http://idt.net/~per2/0498mani.htm>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

whelming bias in favor of women constitutes gender discrimination! And you write a ruling that reinforces women's greater rights.

This case could have been decided in gender neutral terms. The judges could have decided that *all* parents deserve support and a chance to raise kids.

Instead, the court once again reinforced the status of fathers as second-class parents.²⁵⁸

And in other news, fashion model Kathleen McManamon, 27, is strolling down the runway of freedom after a slap on the wrist for harassing and threatening her former boyfriend. McManamon was angry that Roger Wilson dumped her and began dating "Showgirls" actress Elizabeth Berkley.

In pleading guilty to harassment, McManamon admitted that over a period of half a year, from Sept. 3, 1997, and Feb. 5, 1998, she telephoned Wilson to "harass, annoy and alarm" him.

According to the Associated Press: "Manhattan Criminal Court Judge Arlene Goldberg sentenced McManamon to a conditional discharge, ordered her to repay \$630 for car services she billed to Wilson's account, and had her sign an order of protection." McManamon actions were classified as a "violation," which is less serious than a misdemeanor. In other words, her offense is considered less than minor.

McManamon was arrested in January after Wilson reported that she told him: "I know where you live! I know what you look like! You stole my man away from me! I'm going to kill you both."

Meanwhile: How many children have to die before action is taken? In Trotwood, Ohio, a suburb of Dayton, the answer is four and counting.

Four children have died in less than seven months in the house of Regina Moreland. In June, her grandson, 2-year-old Kelab K. Moreland, died while visiting her. He had been in excellent health before the visit.

Two granddaughters and a great-niece of Moreland have died since November after staying with her or visiting her at her previous residence.

The Montgomery County coroner ruled those three deaths homicides, but no charges have been filed against anyone.

These are not the only deaths. Moreland's husband, Phillip, committed suicide in March.²⁵⁹

JULY 1998

WELCOME, READERS, to an issue we'll call "Suffer The Little Children." That certainly seems to be the motto of societies that think children belong only with mothers and other women, even abusive ones. The stories can be heartbreaking, but we have to look at them. We have to see what is being done in the name of feminist "equality."

Suffer the Little Children

In 1992, Latrena D. Pixley got tied of hearing her 6-week-old baby daughter cry. So she smothered the girl with a blanket and dumped the body in a Washington, D.C., trash bin.

She was sentenced to just three years in prison.

Well, not really three years.

And not really prison.

Actually, she got to go to a halfway house. In fact, she only had to go there on weekends.

A feminist once asked us why men make up most of the hardened criminals. We think it's because they usually don't get weekends at a halfway house for committing murder.

Pixley got out on probation and had a boy, Cornilous. In 1996, when the boy was 4 months old, Pixley was sent to prison for credit-card fraud and violating her probation. She asked Laura Blankman, a police officer in Montgomery County, Maryland, to look after the boy.

Blankman did. She even tried to adopt the boy.

But Pixley got out of prison and demanded custody. This, even though she killed her previous child, and even though the boy has been raised most of his life by Blankman.

Not only does she want custody, she just won it.

The Maryland Court of Special Appeals, a three-judge panel, supported the earlier ruling of Montgomery Circuit Court Judge

Michael D. Mason to take the child away from Blankman's home and give him to Pixley, who again lives in a halfway house. They said Mason made "every effort to determine what was in Cornilous' best interest."

They decided that Pixley must have been "mentally ill" with "post-partum depression" when she killed her daughter. Besides, they said, Pixley has since gotten job training and therapy.

We're reminded again of that feminist who wanted to know why men make up most of the hardened criminals. Maybe because when men kill, their actions are labeled as crimes rather than mental illness. They have no "post-partum depression" to fall back on, even though they, too, might snap from the pressures of parenthood. And when they do, they will get hard time in brutal prisons, not therapy and job training.

Ralph Hall Jr., a lawyer for Pixley, says the woman "is a vastly different person than she was in 1992 when there was the unfortunate incident with her daughter."

Unfortunate incident? How is it that if a man shoves a woman, it's called domestic violence, but if a woman kills a baby, it's an "unfortunate incident"?

And why do news stories about "domestic violence" mention men hitting women but never mention women like Latrena Pixley?

Cases like Pixley's are not rare by any means. There's Sharon Alley, accused of cracking the skull of her daughter, 5-month-old Brooke Alley.

The parents separated. Bobby Alley, the baby's father, was given custody of the girl while Sharon Alley awaited trial on a charge of felony child abuse.

But then Judge Susan Deatherage, a Juvenile and Domestic Relations judge in Henry County, Virginia, decided to give Sharon Alley custody again while she was awaiting trial. She did so even though a social service worker recommended that the child and her 9-year-old brother remain with their father.

But custody won't be an issue anymore. On Mother's Day, Sharon Alley fatally stabbed the girl through the heart.

Here is another victim of the blind policy that children belong with the parent who has ovaries, no matter what. No matter if that parent recently cracked the child's skull. No

matter that there is another loving parent whose only offense is being male.

And in Rochester, New York, Barbara Briggs beat her malnourished 3-year-old grandson to death with a cutting board because he was looking in the pantry for food. The boy weighed only 28 pounds at the time of his death, and bore cigaret burns and marks from whippings.

Briggs was sentenced to 25 years in prison.*

Suffer the little children to come unto them.²⁶⁰

A Limitless Choice to Hurt

In the best news we've heard in a while, the West Virginia Supreme Court has upheld a \$7.8 million verdict in favor of a man whose child was put up for adoption without his consent.

Dr. John Kessel had dated Anne Conaty Selvaggi of Huntington, West Virginia for several years. But they broke up shortly before she realized she was pregnant. They reconciled and got engaged, but then she was the one who broke off the engagement.

She then took off for California, where she gave birth to a boy in 1991. She also got adoption lawyer David Keene Leavitt of Beverly Hills to help her put the child up for adoption.

Dr. Kessel obtained a temporary restraining order from a West Virginia court barring an attempt to adopt his son until he could establish paternity. But the jury found that Selvaggi and her lawyer knew about the restraining order and went ahead anyway. They ignored the order and turned the boy over to a couple in Calgary, Canada, where a court ruled that the adoption was final.

In December of 1995, a jury in Cabell County, West Virginia, found lawyer Leavitt and Selvaggi's parents and brother guilty of interfering with Kessel's parental rights and fraudulently concealing the whereabouts of his son. Selvaggi herself was found guilty only of fraudulent concealment. The jury ordered them to pay Kessel \$1.97 million in

* Katherine Shaver, "Md. Appeals Court Rules for Pixley: Panel Backs Judge's Decision to Return Boy to Woman Who Killed Infant Daughter," *The Washington Post*, Friday, July 10, 1998; Page B01; David Reed, "Custody ruling assailed after baby's stabbing death," *Associated Press*.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

compensatory damages and more than \$5 million in punitive damages.

The damage award is believed to be the first of its kind in the United States.

Let's hope it's not the last.

We know what a great many feminists are going to say: that a woman has the right to choose what to do with her body, that it's her right to break off an engagement, that it's her right to be free of caring for the child. Amid all these "rights," today's modern feminists will not take up the matter of responsibilities, or even plain, human decency. They will hide behind a never-ending parade of "rights" in order to justify treating other people disgracefully.

And that includes treating people in ways that feminists wouldn't stand for if men did it to women. If a father had done this, two things would have happened. One, feminists organizations would have raised a huge cry that this was "patriarchal oppression" or some such (even if they deem it well within a woman's rights to do the exact same thing.) And two, this case would have gotten a lot more attention, in the news media, and in popular entertainment. Instead, the case barely attracted any notice. The networks couldn't take a break from their latest fictionalized "men bad, women good" made-for-TV movies long enough to portray a real case like this one.

Selvaggi's actions have every appearance of trying to deliberately hurt a former boyfriend, to plant a knife and twist it just as hard as she could. Her flight to California, her defiance of the court order, and her placing the boy with a couple in another country look to us like nothing but an effort to deny him custody of his own child out of sheer pettiness. If this whole plan of action was not designed to inflict emotional distress on another human being, then what was the purpose?

As for Ms. Selvaggi, she's defending herself on several levels. Noting that she didn't have an abortion, she says: "I did the right thing for my baby. ... I chose to spare that baby's life, to give it life, give it a home, two parents that love the baby."

We wonder what the feminists would think of this. In several cases where a single mother wanted to keep a child instead of letting the child grow up in a home with two

parents or with the father and his parents all providing care, feminists always sided with the single mother. Now all of the sudden, the most important standard is having two parents. We wonder how feminists feel about this slam against single parents.

And we note that Ms. Selvaggi said. "I chose to spare that baby's life."

Tsk, tsk, Ms. Selvaggi. How could you save the baby's life when feminists keep telling us a fetus has no life?²⁶¹

Surprise, Surprise: You Have Rights

An appeals court in New Jersey has ruled that people cannot be convicted without trial on hearsay evidence or an official's whim.

We can hear you saying: "Wait a minute. You mean the same New Jersey that's in the USA? They just now thought of this? We thought Americans had a thing for giving people trials before convicting them."

Sure. But that was before feminists began warning of "epidemics" of abuse sweeping the nation, and before women raised in feminist ideology began seeking posts in governmental agencies. With many social agencies today run by people who have what's politely called an "activist" outlook, rights have become sort of an irritating barrier to their plans.

Here's how New Jersey decided that people actually ought to be given some of their rights back. In two different cases, it ruled that people found guilty of child abuse by the state Division of Youth and Family Services actually deserve an independent hearing before they are denied jobs and labeled abusers. Prior to that, people who faced blatant, barefaced lies about being abusers did have a means of challenging or redressing sometimes ludicrous decisions by the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS).

One case involved a female teacher who was accused by another teacher in 1993 of inappropriate sexual behavior and physical contact involving a student.

The school then notified both the country prosecutor and the DYFS. The prosecutor closed the case without charging her. But that wasn't good enough for the DYFS.

* Jennifer Bundy, "Court upholds award against mother who put child up for adoption," *Associated Press*, n.d.

The DYFS ruled that the charges had been substantiated. Within 72 hours of receiving a report, the DYFS places the accused's name on a central registry of child abusers. So shortly after someone makes an as-yet unsubstantiated accusation, your name is already on the list with real abusers and pedophiles. And good luck removing it.

AT DYFS insistence, the teacher then faced tenure charges. After a hearing that lasted three days, an administrative law judge dismissed every charge and said the accusing student's testimony was unbelievable. Even then, the DYFS refused to change its ruling that the charges had been substantiated. It also refused to remove the woman's name from its list of "abusers."

This is quite typical of today's social welfare agencies, which are staffed with far too many people who think that all the rest of the world is in "denial" and that they themselves are the select and honest few. They don't take "not guilty" for an answer — no matter how many times it's given. This is the same sort of vindictive hysteria that gave us the McMartin preschool fiasco in California, the "satanic cults" in the daycare centers, the Little Rascals case in North Carolina, the Fells Acres case in Massachusetts, and other miscarriages of justice.

But in New Jersey, the teacher persisted, filing a court appeal seeking to have her name removed from the abusers' registry. Previously, the accused could ask only for an informal hearing, and it would be before the same agency — the DYFS — responsible for the person's name being placed on the registry in the first place.

Can you say "kangaroo court"? Sure you can.

Thankfully, the appeals court found that those ridiculous informal hearings before the DYFS just don't cut the mustard when there are serious discrepancies concerning the facts.

"One need only look to the outcome of the tenure hearing to observe the deficiencies in the DYFS procedure," the court found. "Tested in a trial type hearing, (the teacher's) accusers were revealed as liars and plotters."

The court also agreed with the teacher that her employment rights were curtailed without due process when her name was placed on the registry.

The state attorney general's office and the DYFS might appeal the ruling. If they do, that puts the state's top law-enforcement office and an agency that is above the law in the position of arguing that the people should have fewer rights.

We hope the sane solution prevails.

In the second case, a mother was accused of abusing her son and the DYFS decided the charges were substantiated. She asked for one of those hearings with the DYFS, but it didn't change matters. Her name was still placed on the "abusers" registry.

The court decided that she was denied a fundamentally fair way to contest her case.

"It's an affirmation of the court's willingness to guarantee that people accused of serious matters have a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves," said Gregory Diebold of Hudson County Legal Services after representing the mother. "You could have a neighbor, who's having a dispute with you over where you put your back yard steps, call DYFS anonymously and accuse you of abuse. The court is saying you are entitled to a meaningful opportunity to defend yourself."

Surprise, surprise. The tide is turning, and you now actually have rights.

We hope there will be more rulings like these, once the public and the legal system learn more about the "activist" agendas and personal quirks of some of the people staffing these agencies.

One thing bothers us about these cases, though. In both, it took a woman appealing the judgments for the state to decide the accused had rights. We'd like to hope that it was merely a matter of these women presenting good cases, and not that the court would have been complacent about similar unfounded charges against men.

Ceil Zalkind, assistant director of the Association for Children of New Jersey, said he's afraid the ruling could have a negative effect on DYFS caseworkers.*

Apparently, he fears that yanking these people back to reality is a "negative effect."²⁶²

Crackdown on Crack Moms

* Barbara Fitzgerald, "Appeals court says accused abusers entitled to due-process hearings," *The Associated Press*.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Charlie Condon, Attorney General of South Carolina, recently told Congress that his state's crackdown on pregnant women who use drugs has cut the number of babies born addicted to drugs.

"Our approach is not only highly effective, but infinitely humane," Condon told a Senate committee. "It considers the welfare of both the mother and the unborn child."

Under his state's system, women who use illegal drugs after the 24th week of pregnancy can be arrested. But charges will be dropped if they go through a treatment program. Those who refuse face involuntary commitment to a treatment facility before jail.

His state is the only one with such a law, and it's been targeted by those who think that women possess limitless rights to damage children. The American Civil Liberties Union is once again stupidly on the wrong side of the issue, trying to get the law overturned. The ACLU supports our rights to be free of censorship, but not our rights to be free of the damage caused by involuntary drug use. Feminist groups, of course, condemn the policy, saying that whatever a woman does with her body is her choice. It's another case of feminists demanding limitless rights with zero responsibilities.

But in May, the Supreme Court let stand the state's ability to prosecute pregnant drug users. Hopefully this might stiffen a few spines in other states.

The feminists who prize their right to damage unborn children have either never taken a look at these children once they're born, or they just don't care.

Babies born addicted to cocaine suffer uncontrolled trembling, headaches, stomach cramps. They can't tolerate light or even moderate stimulation. They have a tough time bonding with a caregiver because almost any stimulation is too much for them. Just touching them can cause them physical and mental pain. Babies born after extensive exposure to alcohol in the womb suffer a variety of intellectual and emotional handicaps. Learning and behavior problems are common among children who are born addicted.

If anything remotely like this was visited on women in our society, feminists would be screaming that it's genocide.

And yet they defend doing it as their right.²⁶³

Rape: Funny No More

You might remember all the laughter and talk-show jokes that accompanied the case of Mary Kay LeTourneau. She's the Washington state school teacher who seduced a student of hers, a 13-year-old boy, and got pregnant and delivered the child's child. Some people found the situation absolutely hilarious and joked that the boy must be enjoying himself. The fact that this was statutory rape didn't seem to bother them. They never stopped to think what long-term effect it could have on a child to have improper sex at a too-young age with a person who is mentally unbalanced.

Maybe a case out of Hastings, Minnesota will help stop the laughter.

It's uncomfortably similar to the LeTourneau case. Julie Feil, 32, a former high school teacher, has pleaded guilty to criminal sexual conduct with a 15-year-old student. She was sentenced to prison and will be eligible for parole in a little over four years.

All the late-night comics who want to wink about how much the boy must have enjoyed the experience should have been in the courtroom. The boy's father testified on the terrible impact the aftermath of this unwholesome affair has had on his son. The once-carefree boy now is angry and depressed. The boy himself read a statement telling Feil: "I do not love you. You are a sex offender." He called her a monster.

Maybe it's too much to hope that this time there won't be so many jokes.²⁶⁴

Modern-Day Slavers

Police in New York have bust up a ring of people who were enslaving deaf Mexican aliens and forcing them to sell trinkets on the streets and in the subways. The deaf people were kept locked up when not working and sometimes beaten if they did not bring it at least \$100 a day.

As Assistant U.S. Attorney Leslie Cornfeld described it: "What this case is about is an individual exploiting other individuals and holding them as slaves for over five years."

So who were the men responsible for this horrible slavery ring? And we know they must be men, because feminists keep telling us that slavery should be blamed on men, particularly white, European males.

Well, actually the Federal Bureau of Investigation has identified the ringleader of this slavery operation, and she's a woman – Adriana Paoletti Lemus, age 30. She's been sentenced to 14 years in prison and \$1 million in restitution.

Is it a fluke that we find a woman involved? Well, ask her mother, Delia Paoletti. She was also part of the ring, and has been sentenced to five years in prison.

While in prison, they'll have plenty of time to read "Fried Green Tomatoes" and all those other books and movies that assure us that slavery is something done by those dirty, power-mad men.²⁶⁵

Selective Equality

Feminists in Italy have managed to institute another example of selective equality. Selective equality is equality only for women, and only when they want it.

Specifically, Italy's lower house approved a bill that will let women join the armed forces.

Now, if you're going to say that it was gender discrimination that women weren't allowed to join before, consider:

All Italian men must serve at least 10 months. This involuntary servitude never seems to get labeled discrimination.

Also, women still are not required to serve -- not 10 months, not 10 seconds. The bill calls only for voluntary service. Women can join if they want, or they can skip it. The bill specifically gives women choice -- a choice men still do not have.

In other words, women have rights, men have responsibilities.²⁶⁶

Munchausen Mumbo Jumbo

A 31-year-old San Antonio mother has been arrested on charges of injuring and endangered two of her sons. The arrest came while Cynthia Martinez Lyda was already under suspicion in the deaths of two other sons.

Officials are speculating that Ms. Lyda has a psychiatric disorder known as Munchausen's syndrome by proxy, in which

mothers or other caregivers injure, poison, or otherwise harm children in order to gain attention and sympathy. Some like to be seen as courageous figures coping with grief, while others want sympathy.

She is accused of injuring one 8-month-old son four times while he was in a hospital at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas in late 1994. A hidden camera caught her placing gauze in his gastric tube. That boy recovered, and was removed from her custody.

Officials cite a long history of unexplained injuries and deaths of her children. Her attorney says her sons had some sort of genetic disorder.

One curious thing about Munchausen's syndrome by proxy is that it occurs almost exclusively in women.

Does that mean women are somehow more susceptible, more vulnerable?

In our opinion, no. It means that when women commit evil acts for personal gain, society decides they must be "sick." If this disorder was seen mostly in men, it never would have been classified as a "psychiatric disorder" in the first place. It would have been simply call evil.²⁶⁷

Ms. Lyda is being investigated for the deaths of a 25-month-old son and a 2-year-old foster son while she lived in Mesa, Arizona. But Mesa Police Sgt. Earle Lloyd says it is unlikely she'll ever be prosecuted because "they've come up with nothing that can prove she harmed the child."²⁶⁸

Humor: Your Real Motive

Democratic Senator Patty Murray of Washington state seems to be heading for a tough re-election battle against a Republican challenger.

We'd just like to take a moment to direct some comments to Ms. Murray's rival in this race. We think that for the sake of fairness and sexual equality, you should give up any idea of running against Murray. Why would you oppose the idea of a woman holding a Senate seat? Sure, you're probably going to say that you want the job because you think you can do it better. But that's just a smokescreen for your real motive. Obviously, you just want to keep women down. Otherwise you wouldn't object to a woman like Murray having the seat. You say you

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

just want to compete with her for the job, but the real reason is that you want to send women back to the kitchen, barefoot and pregnant. Sure, everyone knows that Murray is a lightweight and an empty suit who lucked into the Senate seat in the first place. But this isn't about her qualifications. The only reason you would claim that you're more qualified for that job instead of her is that you hate women.

Okay, now that we've written this out, we're going to look up the name of Murray's challenger to mail these comments to.

Hmm ... Interesting ...

Murray's opponent is Representative Linda Smith.

Why gosh, that means that Senator Murray is running against ... a woman!

And if Murray wins, she's denying a woman a place in the Senate!

We'd just like to take a moment to direct some comments to Ms. Murray. We think that for the sake of fairness and sexual equality, you should give up any idea of running against Smith...²⁶⁹

SEPTEMBER 1998

WELCOME, READERS, and our apologies for our recent hiatus. We're back in the swing with an issue we're sure you'll love if just for the title alone. It's called "The Failed Morality of Liberalism." Does it have something to do with Bill Clinton? How did you guess! Also, you'll read about a really swinging teacher, and we ask the burning question: does feminism cause cancer? Enjoy.

The Only True Sin

President Bill Clinton has admitted what was obvious to those willing to look objectively at the facts: that he had a sexual relationship with White House intern Monica Lewinsky and lied about it. After denying the affair, after attempting to smear and intimidate those who dared disagree with him, Mr. Clinton finally admitted the truth only when he was backed into a corner.

The feminist response to the Clinton scandals again displays that feminism is not a movement of principles or morality. It is a movement of cynically calculated expediency in which the only true sin is not being of

benefit to feminism. "Per's Rule of Feminist Support" is verified once again: to feminists, it doesn't matter how you treat or mistreat women, just so long as you treat feminists well.

By his own admission, Clinton had engaged in the type of behavior that usually draws the condemnation of feminists and results in termination or worse for less powerful people. In addition, there are numerous other accusations that have not yet been proven. In the case of both Clarence Thomas and Senator Bob Packwood, such he-said/she-said accusations alone were enough for the feminists to demand that these men should be removed.

With Bob Packwood, feminists ran newspaper adds demanding to know: If your boss stuck his tongue in your mouth, would he still have a job?

Now we know that Mr. Clinton has stuck his cigar in a White House intern, that he is accused of groping Kathleen Willey in a manner that might have made Packwood blush. But Clinton still has his job. And feminists want him to.

Eleanor Smeal, Patricia Ireland, Betty Friedan, and other feminist leaders held a press conference to say that Mr. Clinton should remain in office, despite a longer list of misconduct and accusations than Thomas and Packwood combined.* These feminists made it clear that their reaction to Clinton's misdeeds was entirely political -- they like his politics, so they don't want him removed.

In other words, an act is an offense if feminists don't like you, and it's not an offense if they do like you. Your actual guilt or innocence are irrelevant. Truth is irrelevant. You are to be tried and convicted based on whether you have a record of helping feminists.

And no, that is not hyperbole. Just ask Barbara Battalino, who used to be a psychiatrist at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Boise, Idaho. The Clinton administration's Justice Department just had her fired and arrested for one act of oral sex in the workplace. Battalino lost her job, was fined

* Lawrence L. Knutson, "Feminists Urge Against Impeachment," *Associated Press*, Thursday, September 24, 1998; 6:01 p.m. EDT. Available at: <http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WAPO/19980924/V000808-092498-idx.html>

\$3,500, and was sentenced to six months of house arrest. She had performed oral sex once on a patient under her care and was caught lying about it.*

As chief executive, Mr. Clinton is in charge of a government that regularly punishes people for that same sort of conduct that he insists is just between him and his family when he does it. Air Force lieutenant Kelly Flinn was discharged when she committed adultery and was caught lying about it. Men in the military have gotten worse punishment for that offense, including military prison. The Army disciplined or discharged several male drill sergeants who faced unproven accusations of having sex with female recruits — punishments that feminists solidly supported. (They were sorry only when some men were acquitted.)

The White House rescinded a job offer for Joseph Holley, who had sold his home and moved to Washington to be a speech writer for Hillary Rodham Clinton. He was denied the job when the White House learned he had been a defendant in a sexual discrimination and harassment lawsuit seven years ago -- even though he was cleared. Hershel Gober had to withdrawn his nomination to be the Clinton administration's secretary for veterans affairs because of four-year-old, unproven accusations of "sexual misconduct."

And so on.

One has to wonder about the impact of all this on the military and Clinton's power to punish soldiers or send them into danger. It has not escaped the notice of soldiers "that if Clinton were a service member, he certainly would be facing a court-martial on multiple charges and likely eviction from the military for violating fundamental precepts of fidelity and integrity."[†]

Mr. Clinton is overseeing a government that tacitly is finding people guilty of not being Mr. Clinton.

Feminists are advocating a program of punishing people found guilty of not being useful to feminists.²⁷⁰

The Failed Morality of the Liberals

The Clinton-Lewinsky scandal has thrown the double standards of feminism and liberalism into high relief.

Sometimes liberals are quite open about their double standards, while other times they deny even those double standards that are glaringly obvious. They are, for example, quite open about their agenda to discriminate against people based on their skin color, ethnic group, or sex, just so long as the discrimination benefits people in the liberal camp. However, they deny they are engaging in racial or sexual stereotypes even as they flail away at "dead white European males," "the patriarchy," "male oppressors," and so on.

Feminists have gone to absurd lengths to deny that they have double standards in the cases of Clinton, Clarence Thomas, and Bob Packwood. A coalition of feminist leaders -- including many groups who demanded harsh punishments for other men accused of sexual misconduct -- recently rallied around Bill Clinton. They issued a statement that said: "As feminist leaders, we will not stand idly by while a Congress made up of nearly 90 percent men attempts to remove the first president elected by women voters."[‡]

The hypocrisy of that statement rolls richly on the tongue. We are to understand that Congress is somehow bad. Why? Because it's mostly male. Male equals bad. And Clinton, who has probably mistreated and harassed more women than any president since John F. Kennedy, is to be defended. Why? Because he was elected by women. Woman equals good.

And, oh, by the way: Feminists are opposed to gender stereotypes and sexism, you know.

In a way, the Clinton fiasco provides a valuable, widely published example of the moral dishonesty of the major feminist organizations. It helps the public understand

* Deborah Orin, "Doc Paid Stiff Price for Lying Like Bill," *The New York Post*, n.d. Available at: <http://www.nypostonline.com/news/5112.htm>

† Bradley Graham, "Military Leaders Worry Privately About Impact; Some Troops Offended by Double Standard," *The Washington Post*, Tuesday, September 15, 1998; Page A10. Available at: <http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-09/15/0821-091598-idx.html>

‡ John F. Harris, "Clinton Team Regains Optimism As Battle Moves to Political Realm" *The Washington Post*, Friday, September 25, 1998; Page A18. Available at: <http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-09/25/0751-092598-idx.html>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

just what type of amoral policies are being advanced in the name of "fairness." Previously, this awareness was limited mostly to those who took the trouble to examine the holes in the phony statistics, the fabricated studies, the skewed research, and outright propaganda that feminists had succeed so well in placing in the mainstream media. Now, the malleable and convenience-prone ethics of feminism are manifest for all to see.

The modern hero of liberalism and feminism is Bill Clinton. Once upon a time, Clinton said: "No question that an admission of making false statements to government officials and interfering with the FBI is an impeachable offense." Clinton was applying this standard to Richard Nixon in 1974. In liberal fashion, he considers himself exempt from the standards he applies to others.

Clinton also said: "I think it is plain that the president should resign and spare the country the agony of impeachment and removal proceedings."

Now, of course, Clinton has been caught making false statements to government officials. His administration some how illegal obtained 700 FBI files, most of them on political enemies. In the Nixon administration, Charles Colson went to prison for receiving just one FBI file illegally.

But when Clinton acts as though the rules should not apply to him, he is right in step with today's liberal movement: Liberals believe it is their place to dictate moral principles, not to follow them.

The ethics of liberalism today are pretty much the same: Rules are for other people to obey. Morality is something that you use to manipulate moral people. An offense is an offense only if someone else commits it. Discrimination, hatred, sexism, and racism are bad only when directed at groups in the liberal fold. It's acceptable, even desirable, to aim those same attacks at people the liberals don't like or can't use.

If these words anger you, then show us liberal politicians who are opposing man-

bashing and anti-male policies. Show us feminists who oppose anti-male propaganda. Show us liberals who are willing to say that discrimination based on sex or skin color is wrong when the sex is male and the skin color is white.

If you cannot show us such liberals, then our point is well taken. From there, liberals will merely try to justify the bigotry and expediency in their camp.

When morality and fairness become a topic for liberal leaders, it consists of them telling all the rest of us what we must do and what sacrifices we must make to make the world a better place.

Of course, this world usually ends up being a better place only for liberals. And once they are in control of the lives of the rest of us, they feel no compunction to practice the moral principles they demand that we follow. They tell us it is wrong to discriminate, to stereotype, to hate people because of their sex or the color of their skin. And when they gain power, they actively discriminate against us, stereotype us, and hate us because of our sex or the color of our skin.

What is particularly scary about liberals is that there are no liberal Commandments we can cite, no liberal book of moral teachings we can quote, to ask them to conduct themselves in a moral and ethical manner. If there is someone on the conservative Christian right who is being hateful or judgmental, we can point out how these actions are un-Christian. But how can you tell a liberal that affirmative-action discrimination and class warfare are un-liberal when they are at the heart of liberalism?

If a political conservative preaches racial bigotry, we can point out that the political system they are defending insists that all men are created equal. We can appeal to their moral conscience. But what liberal work can we cite to ask liberals to behave morally? "The Feminine Mystique"? "The SCUM Manifesto"? Ms. Magazine?

When feminists engage in anti-male hatred and discrimination, many people mistakenly thought they could appeal to feminism's moral conscience by pointing out that feminism (supposedly) was opposed to such gender bigotry. After several decades of trying to do so, those people have only wasted their breath, and feminism has gone on

* Juliet Eilperin and Peter Baker, "Release of Clinton Tape Delayed: Partisan Bickering Forces House Panel to Continue Debate Today," *The Washington Post*, Friday, September 18, 1998; Page A01. Available at: <http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-09/18/1021-091898-idx.html>

promoting anti-male hatred, anti-family and anti-father sentiments, and discrimination.

This is because feminist literature and Women's Studies courses are not about fairness or equality -- they are about sexual partisanship -- female chauvinism and bigotry.

Accusing feminists of gender bias does not faze them. They've never really been against it. Oh, it's wrong if *you* engage in gender bias against them, but they feel entitled to wield that sword themselves.

Feminist programs on "domestic violence" are not aimed at ending violence in the home. They are aimed only at ending violence against women. Women's violence -- against men, against children, and against other women -- is not a concern of the "domestic violence" activists. Violence is only wrong when done to them, but not when done by them.

Feminist programs on language have managed to replace "chairman" with "chairperson" and "policeman" with "police officer," while maintaining "con man," "bag man," "hit man," "gun man." Feminist programs on the Bible have tried to remove references to God as male or as a father -- while keeping the devil male. Feminists strive to remove what they see as bias against women, while also reinforcing bias against men.

We can't ask liberals to behave ethically because their ethics are fluid and situational at best. They define some group as the "oppressor" and some group as the "oppressed." Then any attack a supposedly oppressed person makes on a human being who is pigeonholed as an "oppressor" is deemed a noble act of liberation, retribution, and freedom. Maybe you just didn't realize you were an "oppressor" when you were denied a job for being male.

That's why the feminist movement, which came to power claiming to oppose gender discrimination and stereotypes, immediately began practicing gender discrimination and stereotypes. Why? Because they were discriminating against the male "oppressor" in favor of the female "victim." It didn't matter if the man they were discriminating against came from a poor background and the women benefitting from all this were upper-class. Goodness and badness were assigned by

your group. The "good" people could then use the dirtiest of tactics, including but not limited to character assassination, false accusations, phony science, gender discrimination, censorship, intolerance toward differing views, and even violence, to attack the "bad" people and benefit the "good."

In liberalism there are no "shall nots." There are no actions that are wrong no matter who does them. There is only "thou shall not do this to me, but I can do it to you."

And they do.

Bill and Hillary Clinton came to office promising the most moral administration in the history of the republic. They have left a trail of lies, bribery, abuses of power, defiance of the law, invasion of privacy, corruption, misrepresentation, smear tactics, dirty tricks.

And through it all, the Clintons have been perfect exemplars of liberal morality. They have committed every offense they supposedly objected to -- they objected to them only when they were done by someone else.

Looking back on the Watergate scandal of Republican President Richard Nixon, we realize that Nixon would never have been removed without the actions of many Republicans of conscience who decided Nixon had gone too far. In the Clinton scandal, a similar sense of conscience has been glaringly absent from the Democratic ranks. Senator Joseph Lieberman made a brief and heartfelt objection to the immorality of Clinton. But Democratic loyalists have since closed ranks around the president. Perjury and obstruction of justice? They are sins only when someone else commits them.²⁷¹

Crackdown on Crack Moms, Part II

The feminist movement is known for continually sounding the alarm that the rights of women are supposedly being eroded.

Of course, it's a pretty odd catalog of rights. Like the right to sever your husband's penis, or to kill him while he's sleeping. The right to be free of discrimination while practicing it against others. The right to take out your hostilities on men in a workplace that must be free of hostilities against you. The right to have any man fired on the unprovable claim that you were made uncomfortable by his jokes, even if you tell the same kind of jokes yourself.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Now another "right" seems to be eroding: the right to take drugs while pregnant, to subject an unborn child to a lifetime of crippling maladies or premature death, and then dump the responsibility on society.

In Aurora, Illinois, Cynthia Smith was sent to jail after giving birth to five babies born with cocaine in their systems.

Our reaction is not "Oh, it's her body, her choice, her rights are being violated."

Nope. Our reaction is, "Why did it take so long?"

According to a Chicago Tribune article, "Beginning in 1992, Smith gave birth to a cocaine baby each year for five years. The last baby was stillborn in 1997."

Technically, Smith wasn't jailed for harming the children. She was jailed for violating her probation by testing positive for drugs and for missing sessions with her probation officer and a drug rehabilitation program.

If a male drug user had punched a pregnant woman in the stomach and caused damage or death to the fetus, we doubt he would have been let loose to do it four more times.²⁷²

A Letter to Manifesto

Here's a letter we just received relating to Tracie Ribitch, the 19-year-old Macomb County, Michigan, woman who stuffed gauze into the mouth of her newborn child and left it to die. She was sentenced to lecturing teenagers about safe sex. (We first mentioned this slap on the wrist in the March 1997 issue of MANifesto.)

Then we got a letter purporting to be from the brother of Ms.

Ribitch. It says:

To: <per2@idt.net>

Subject: Fuck Off

From: "Frank J. Ribitch III"

<ribitch@cps.cmich.edu>

Date: Mon, 14 Sep 1998 10:57:28 -0400

Dear asshole

My name is Frank J. Ribitch III, the brother of Tracie Ribitch. Until you know all of the facts on my sisters case, shut the fuck up. The only things you know on the case are the lies the local media publishes. By deleting

words from quotes, an new quote meaning the exact opposite of the original is created, which the media did. You want the truth, go to the court transcripts, not the press. Because of assholes like yourselves, my family was fucked over. Fuck off!!

Our response: We can understand your desire to protect your sister, but we also know what the facts are. An innocent and defenseless child was killed. Ms. Ribitch was "sentenced" to giving lectures to teenagers. We can't help but wonder how this is going to be received by that teenage audience. It presents to impressionable teenagers that you can kill a child and receive an absurdly light sentence. What if a member of that audience decides that this form of punishment is worth it to get out of parenthood?

If you really are Ms. Ribitch's brother, then the child that was killed was not some inconvenient "choice." It was your niece or nephew. We think people should feel some obligation to protect those lives, as well.²⁷³

Feminism Causes Cancer?

Does feminism cause cancer? No, we're not talking about the moral rot of shifting principles and situational ethics so common to feminism. We're talking about skin cancer.

Cancer experts in England say that children are going to be more vulnerable to skin cancer because teachers have been told not to help students apply sun screen. The reason: fear of sexual harassment accusations.

The Local Government Association and teachers unions are telling teachers they should refuse to apply sun screen to students even if the parents request it.

According to an article in the Electronic Telegraph: "Cancer experts urged the LGA to reconsider, pointing to research showing that children who suffer severe sunburn are twice as likely to develop skin cancer later. Kate Law, of the Cancer Research Campaign, said: 'A lot of youngsters are going to do a haphazard, dabbing job. It is a great shame they can't be helped.'"

Indeed it is a shame. But the shame is not on the teachers.

Much as we regret this situation, we can't blame them. Feminists have fostered an atmosphere of paranoia in this area. We can't blame people for being too careful after

* "Woman Jailed For Using Drugs While On Probation," *Chicago Tribune*, n.d. Available at: <<http://chicagotribune.com/splash/article/0,1051,SAV-9808060276,00.html>>

teachers and day-care operators have had their lives ruined over imaginary offenses: "satanic" cults that didn't exist, "ritual abuse" that never occurred, and false memories brought on by the darling of the feminist movement, Recovered Memory Therapy. If you can have your life ruined by the phantoms running through the twisted imagination of feminists, how can you blame people for being careful?

Now that feminists have made people afraid to protect students from skin cancer, they can go back to defending a president who applies cigars to a White House intern.

Meanwhile, more bad news from the U.K. An article in *The Guardian* states:

"Men are turning away from careers as primary school teachers because they fear being branded perverts for showing an interest in working with young children, according to evidence presented yesterday to the British Educational Research Association conference in Belfast."

"... Mary Thornton, a researcher at Hertfordshire University specialising in male teacher recruitment, said physical contact with children was one of the key concerns brought up by men on teacher training programmes."

"For females, working with young children is viewed as an extension of the mothering role. When males opt for primary teaching or work with young children, it is perceived as unnatural... Fear of such perceptions is present amongst these students and may be a factor in deterring men from work with young children," Dr Thornton said."

The article also notes that David Hart, general secretary of the National Association of Head Teachers, said that if the research is correct, it is a horrifying reflection of the fact that teachers are becoming obsessed by the risk of prosecution for child abuse, though he expressed skepticism as to whether it was so.

When we hear of such fears and stereotypes, we wonder who benefits from them.

Figures show that female teachers in nursery and primary schools outnumber men by about five to one. There is no equality there. When a situation is biased in favor of women, you no longer hear feminists calling for equality.

Now is that because women make such better teachers?

Ask the students of Hermina Brunson.

In New York, this substitute teacher has been arrested and charged with bashing students with chairs. Her reason: she wanted to stop the class from making noise.

Brunson, 64, allegedly injured two 11-year-old students by swinging metal-and-wood chairs at them.

One of the injured students, Olivia Boyd, said Brunson hit her on the left side of the face. "I ducked twice and she hit me on the cheek with the chair the third time," she is quoted in the May 6 *New York Post*.

The ensuing investigation revealed that Ms. Brunson had previously been banned from city schools for a year for using corporal punishment, but she was somehow rehired. Schools officials are at a loss to explain that.

Remember, don't be sexist when you refer to Ms. Brunson. She's a chair woman, not a chair man.

And in Fukuoka, Japan, nine women have been charged with robbing more than 50 businessmen after the men drank too much. The women are accused of taking more than \$150,000 over four years from their inebriated male victims.

You go, girl.

Straight to jail, that is.²⁷⁴

When they get out, these women should have a great future ahead of them. They have all the essential talents of an affirmative action director.²⁷⁵

Men's Health

We were encouraged to see that September 21-27 was the 10th Annual Prostate Cancer Awareness Week. Kudos to The National Men's Resource Center for publishing much valuable info on its website...²⁷⁶

Here's what Gordon Clay, Executive Director of The National Men's Resource Center has to say:

"The first year of the program (1989), there were fewer than 100 screening centers in the United States. Today, this number has increased to over 1000 locations providing free or low-cost prostate cancer screening. ... This public awareness and education program was conceived and instituted by the Prostate Cancer Education Council (PCEC) which represents urology, oncology, patient advocacy, minorities, clinical and behavioral

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

research. Because of the alarming percentage of men presenting advanced, incurable prostate cancer, the PCED was formed in 1988 to promote awareness, screening and early detection of prostate cancer. General Norman Schwartzkopf has served as national PCAW chairman since 1994 and in 1996 actor Danny Glover joined as co-chairman in order to help recruit African American men, who have the highest risk of prostate cancer in the world. Over 300,000 men will be diagnosed this year and 41,000 will die because they didn't get an examination soon enough.²⁷⁷

The National Men's Resource Center
PO Box 800, San Anselmo, CA 94979²⁷⁸

When Bill Clinton Farts in an Elevator

- 1.) Blames the White House travel office. Has them fired.
- 2.) Hillary stands by her man ... just not so close.
- 3.) N.O.W. is brought in to declare that everything smells just fine.
- 4.) When he says he didn't inhale, this time we believe him.
- 5.) White House mysteriously loses the receipt to Bill's Bean-A-Rama Mega Meal at Taco Bell.
- 6.) Bill defines "farting" to not include flatulence.
- 7.) Turning green and fainting is declared to be a sign you're a member of the vast right-wing conspiracy.
- 8.) But most important of all ...
DON'T LIGHT THAT CIGAR!²⁷⁹

OCTOBER 1998

WELCOME, READERS, as we peddle you an issue we'll entitle "LIKE A FISH NEEDS A BICYCLE." Guess that makes us a *spokes* person. Hahaha. Ahem.

Anyway, this issue takes a look at that recent report that claims that men prefer "anorexic" women to overweight ones. More on the White House scandal: should he be ousted? A report on girl bullies. And did you know that U.S. law mandates different rights for people based on the sex of a parent? Read on and enjoy!

Like a Fish Needs a Bicycle

The feminists have a slogan: a woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle.

When women decide they no longer need the man they married and head for the door, they usually take the kids with them.

That means they're making the decision for the children, too: children need a father like a fish needs a bicycle.

Well, actually, children need fathers a bit more than that. Especially boys.

A new study shows that boys who grow up fatherless are twice as likely to land in jail.

The study tracked 6,000 males aged 14 to 22 from 1979 to 1993. Boys whose fathers were absent from the home had double the odds of being incarcerated. That held true even when other factors such as race, income, parents' education and urban residence were held constant. In each category, at each level of family income, in each neighborhood, good or bad, the boys who grew up without fathers were twice as likely to go to jail.

Fatherlessness was the greatest predictor of a boy having trouble with the law.

Feminists might ask, "What patriarchal, dads-rights, female-oppressing backslashers wrote this report?" Well, the study was done by a couple of "patriarchs" named Cynthia Harper at the University of Pennsylvania and Sara S. McLanahan of Princeton University. They presented their study to a meeting of the American Sociological Association on August 21 of this year.

We know that feminists love to blame male problems on "testosterone" and "male ego." And they've gotten a lot of men out there to do the same. But those qualities, in the form of a loving father, involved the prevention rather than the cause of many problems. The rise in crime among young males is directly tied to the feminist divorce revolution.

It's no secret that feminists from Simone de Beauvoir to Betty Friedan to Hillary Rodham Clinton have compared the family to slavery and prison and declared that the family oppresses women. Feminists launched an assault on the family. Now that many of the casualties of that assault are boys and young men, they blame the vic-

tims. They seem to think there must be something the matter with males if they turn out badly merely because their families were destroyed.

And we know that many feminists are going to blame this problem on "deadbeat dads" who don't pay child support. But, for starters, the study showed that child support payments did not seem to make a difference in a boy's odds of going to jail. Hint to feminists: stop thinking about money so much and start thinking about humanity. Feminists are supposed to be so much more sensitive to the plight of the needy and the powerless. They should start acting that way when it comes to our children.

But there's something else about "deadbeat dads." The newspapers rarely admit it, but a lot of men who stop paying child support have been denied child visitation. They have spiteful ex-wives who thwart their efforts to have a relationship with their kids, while the ex-wives still demand money for their purses.

But the next time you hear the phrase "deadbeat dad," reflect on this. You never heard that term before the feminist divorce revolution. Deadbeat dads are a product of the feminist era in which "women need men like a fish needs a bicycle."

So what happens when mom walks out the door on her feminist crusade of empowerment and starts shacking up with some other guy? The study found that boys who grow up with a stepfather in the home are at even higher risk for going to jail. Their odds are about triple that of boys who live with both natural parents.

We don't blame any women for getting out of a marriage or relationship with an unfit or abusive partner. But the divorce explosion over the last several decades has been fueled by a lot of women who were not in abusive marriages, but marriages that had hit rough spots, or even marriages that had become boring to them. They had been told by feminists that virtually everything is "oppression" of women, and they heard the feminist slogan that they should "have it all."

That slogan involves some particularly ugly sentiments when feminists decide to "have it all" no matter who else gets hurt. Feminists want to be able to instantly end their commitment to marriage, but they don't want

the ex-husband's commitment to them to end -- ever. They want to break up the home for any reason, including the most selfish reasons, and then assume that they will automatically receive monthly payments to continue their lifestyles. They want to move in with a new boyfriend no matter how that boyfriend treats their children. They want to deny their children a chance to have a relationship with their father while demanding the father finance this whole selfish mess.*

They want "to have it all," and they want someone else to foot the bill.²⁸⁰

Fat Chance

The latest bit of man-bashing research we've seen is a U.S. study that purports to show that young men would rather date an anorexic woman than one who is obese. The impression the study leaves hanging in the air is that men are shallow, sex-driven beasts whose interest in women is only skin deep.

But of course you knew that already, right?

The study was reported in the journal "Woman and Health" by Jeffrey Sobal and co-author Mark Burszty. Mr. Sobal is a "nutritional sociologist" (we're not kidding) at Cornell University. Good old Cornell. That's the place that once punished four male students for circulating a list of tasteless jokes, then took no action against feminists who sent them death threats. Good old Cornell, where freedom of speech blows in the political wind.

So what's wrong with Mr. Sobal's purported study? The vagueness of the term "anorexic." It has been tossed around to mean "thinner than average," or even "wanting to be thinner than average." We've seen some fairly curvaceous models like Elle Macpherson described as "anorexic" when clearly they are no such thing.

Yo, researchers. Check the pinups and nude photographs that men are looking at. Take a gander at all that stuff on the Internet. Do you see even a single men's magazine or website that features women who are genuinely anorexic? Maybe you missed it that the

* "Boys With Absentee Dads Twice as Likely to Be Jailed: Stepfathers Don't Help, Study Finds," Reuters, *The Washington Post*, Friday, August 21, 1998; Page A03. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-08/21/0971-082198-idx.html>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

overwhelming majority of men are recoiling in horror at how thin Calista Flockhart of TV's "Ally McBeal" has become.

Yo, readers. In all the worthless spam you've had land in your mailbox, have you ever seen one that promised "Hot Anorexic Action"? How about, "Our Girls Have Thighs Smaller Than Their Kneebones"? Or even, "Two-Way Anorexic Swinging. Or Maybe It's Three, They're So Thin It's Easy To Miss One Of 'Em."

We suppose that a smutty anorexic web-site would be rated III. Those are Xs that got really thin.

Except for one thing: you don't see smutty anorexic websites. Or men's magazines.

What you might see, however, are fashion magazines aimed at women. The models in such magazines usually are far, far thinner than the average male prefers. And it's the women who are buying these magazines and supporting the look.

Here is a challenge to every last feminist who claims that it's men who want "anorexic" women. Send us the URL of any porno website that advertises its models as anorexic, and we'll print it next issue. If feminists are correct that virtually 110% of all men are lusting after anorexic women, the Internet should be awash in these sites. So name just one. After all, you can't do a web search for "brussels sprouts" without getting hits for a porn site in Belgium. So it should be real easy to find anorexia sites – if they're out there.

But back to Mr. Sobal's study. This survey was widely reported in the news media as showing that men didn't want to date someone with anorexia nervosa or bulimia. Oddly enough, Mr. Sobal found the exact same thing about women. It was men who got the negative headlines, though. Curious.

Furthermore, the researchers "said their findings show that when it comes to dating, looks are still more important than substantive factors like intelligence and personality -- at least to young men."

Booooo, men. Such cads!

But we wonder if Mr. Sobal would like to survey women on whether they would prefer rich men to men of average income. Would they prefer men who hold lots of power and status, or average guys? Would they marry a man shorter than them, or one who made

less money? Maybe women define "personality" as "having \$10 million."

Remember Anne Nicole Smith -- a Playboy centerfold and certainly no anorexic. She married an ancient, liver-spotted millionaire who had to go down the wedding aisle in a wheelchair.

You certainly can't accuse her of being obsessed with looks when she married a dude who looked like death warmed over. We suppose she just loved his intelligence and personality.

We'd like to see the news media run the equivalent of Mr. Sobal's study, examining all the shallow things that women want. But you know what the odds of that are. Fat chance.

Mr. Sobal also opines: "We are still a weight-obsessed society." But as we've stated in the January 1998 issue of Per's MANifesto, the leading cause of death among women in the U.S. is heart disease, which is directly related to being overweight. Excess weight contributes to higher cholesterol, higher blood pressure, and other unhealthful conditions. It's being too heavy that is killing women, not being too thin.

Kudos to the Reuters news agency when it covered Mr. Sobal's study. It added something that Mr. Sobal didn't tell you: "... about 55 percent of adult Americans, or 97 million adults, are overweight or obese, according to government standards issued in June." "Weight obsessed"? It sounds as though we could stand a little more of it.

If men prefer slimmer women to obese women, they are preferring women who are healthier and who have a chance to live longer. Therefore feminists accuse men of starving women to death. If men preferred heavy women, would feminists shut up? Not a chance. They'd say we're fattening women to death.

By now you should grasp the first principle of feminism: whatever men do, it's evil. If they do the opposite, that's evil, too.

Mr. Sobal's survey said men and women both avoid relationships with someone who has an eating disorder, but men would rather date a woman with anorexia or bulimia than one who is badly overweight. "Though eating disorders are stigmatized, obesity is much more so," he says.

Hello, Mr. Sobal. Didn't you notice that being badly overweight involves an eating disorder? You see, food has calories, Mr. Sobal, and the body will store extra calories as fat. Eating extremely excessive amounts of food results in excessive amounts of fat."

We're always glad to help out a nutritional sociologist. Especially one from Cornell.²⁸¹

Bully for Them

Someone once said that "he who becomes a beast gives up the pain of being human."

We could add: "she who becomes a feminist does likewise."

As girls leave their "traditional" roles, incidents of violence, violent crime, and anti-social acts such as bullying also increase. Feminists have long blamed violent behavior on testosterone: they have tried to paint it as a male thing. You know: women good, men bad. But as more and more females take up the stressful roles that men have always had to bear, they start lashing out in increasing numbers.

Let's take a look at just one aspect of this form of "progress:" bullying.

A recent study in a British journal reported that bullying by girls is on the increase while efforts to stop it are lagging.

The study is reported in the British Medical Journal, in an issue released the last week of September/first week of October. It "concluded that while bullying intervention strategies introduced in schools during the past few years have been effective with boys, they have been less successful with girls who bully. This snapshot study of 900 pupils aged 11 to 17 in two secondary schools found that bullying by girls was proportionately higher than it was three years ago."

Part of the problem in dealing with girls' bullying is that boy's bullying tends to be more overt while girls' tends to be more subtle.

Peter Smith, professor of psychology at Goldsmiths College, noted that "If a boy bullies, he tends to hit out or take something from another child so you can see it happening and therefore there's usually an objective answer; but with girls it's more to do with

the systematic and hurtful spreading of nasty stories and social exclusion, which is harder to identify and therefore harder to deal with."

Michelle Elliott of Kidscape, which operates a help line for young people, "agrees that girls have always bullied in a more covert and elusive manner but believes that increasingly they are also becoming physically violent. Kidscape's help line has reported a huge increase of girl bullying over the last two years ... with the younger women reporting violence on an alarming scale, such as broken bones, black eyes and even having their heads shaved."

"But if girls are behaving more like boys, why then aren't anti-bullying strategies being just as effective with them? Elliott believes it's because 'we're not adequately addressing the problem with girls. We assume it's all verbal, so while prevention policies have been successful in encouraging boys to be more gentle, we haven't been reaching out to girls in the same way.'"

In other words, we've always assumed that girls' bullying is somehow nicer, or at least not as much of a problem. And just like in every other area of life, our tactics with the girls has always been gentler. We whip boys and wonder why they turn out angry. We counsel girls and wonder why they turn out better.

In liberating girls from passive roles, experts say the pendulum has swung too far. Girls "don't seem to be able to find the balance between being up front and being in-your-face," Eliot says.

We're not surprised at all by that. In movies and popular entertainment, feminism has put on a low brow and taken the low road. Torching an ex-boyfriend's car is acceptable if he hurt your feelings ("Waiting to Exhale"). Gunning down men is a form of liberation ("Thelma and Louise"). Revenge is a sacrament ("The First Wives Club"). Hostility as a basic outlook is promoted, while constraint is seen as unliberated, oppressive. If you aren't out there smacking someone around or laying a trap for them, then you just aren't liberated.

And while feminists celebrate the increase in girls in cyberspace, keep one thing in mind: it gives them just another way to bully. The tactics of exclusion and harass-

* "Men avoid dating obese women?" *Reuters*, August 17 1998.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

ment work just as well, or even better, on the net.

From The Age, Melbourne, Australia: "A survey of 180 students at a Melbourne girls' school has found that while traditional forms of indirect bullying such as verbal abuse, name-calling and spreading rumors are still the most popular forms of harassment, more girls are turning to technology to bully and 'freeze' out their classmates."

Findings of the survey by psychologists Ms Jenny Ricketts and Ms Joan Beckwith were presented at the Australian Psychological Society's conference in Melbourne. "Ms Ricketts said social exclusion through technology was becoming an increasingly prevalent and worrying practice in girls' schools. This form of bullying includes making prank phone calls, sending sarcastic or abusive e-mails or excluding others from an e-mail network.

"Ms Ricketts said while all forms of bullying were harmful, social exclusion bullying among girls was of particular concern.

"The survey of year 7 to 12 students found that 86per cent of girls had experienced some form of bullying at the school. Of these, 13per cent said the bullying had persisted for several months or more."

While we're on the topic, let us tell you about Municipal Judge Joan Comparet-Cassani in Long Beach, California.

She was presiding over a sentencing hearing for a convicted thief, Ronnie Hawkins. Hawkins kept interrupting her. She got tired of it.

So she ordered the bailiff to activate the remote-control stun belt wired around Hawkins' waist. Hawkins was not threatening anyone. He was not trying to escape. He was already shackled and chained. He just wouldn't be quiet.

So Hawkins was slammed with 50,000 volts of electricity above his left kidney. The attack lasted for eight seconds.*

* Marina Cantacuzino, "Deadlier than the male: New research suggests that bullying by girls is on the increase. So why haven't recent initiatives worked?" *The Guardian*, Wednesday, October 7, 1998. Available at: <<http://reports.guardian.co.uk/articles/1998/10/7/25820.htm>>; Carolyn Jones, "New-age bullies use cyberspace to harass peers," *The Age*, Melbourne, Australia, October 6, 1998. Available at: <<http://www.theage.com.au/daily/981006/news/news15.htm>>

Stephen Yagman, a lawyer representing Hawkins in a civil rights suit against Ms. Comparet-Cassani and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, says: "I think only a deprived or sadistic person would ever use an instrument of torture like the stun belt for simply refusing to be quiet."²²

Good for the Goose

We all know about the White House sex scandal, so let's get down to business.

A report on his sexual misconduct says he violated standards for continuing in his job, and that he "clearly showed poor judgment and lack of discretion." He has two women on record making sexual harassment accusations against him. After an investigation, a report recommended that he be removed from office.

Should he be?

He already has been.

He is John Hicks, former U.S. ambassador to Eritrea and a career foreign service officer. He was nominated by Bill Clinton. Hicks' resignation was demanded and received in 1997 after two women made accusations of sexual harassment. Their accusations remain unproven, he-said/she-said affairs. But Mr. Hicks is out.

In any other administration, Mr. Hicks might have gotten a fair chance. He might have been presumed, under the American law he represents abroad, to be considered innocent until proven guilty. But not in the administration of William Jefferson Clinton. Mr. Clinton depends far too much on the support of feminists, who bail him out time and again when his own zipper problems once more become the nightly news. Male feminists like Bill Clinton will always sacrifice other men in order to stay in good with feminists.

We know what feminists and Clinton supporters will say: the accusations against Clinton are politically motivated. But *every* sexual harassment accusation is politically motivated. It all depends on whether the woman likes the man, or the offer. Basic corporate policy on sexual harassment says that if she feels harassed, then she was. It's not what you do that causes the

ml>; Minerva Canto, "Stun Belts Spur Civil Rights Talk," *Associated Press*, Thursday, August 6, 1998.)

crime. It's how she feels. If she likes you, or if she likes Clinton, it's not harassment.

Feminists will respond that Clinton's case is special because it involves political enemies. Hey, there are "political" enemies anytime people are competing for a promotion, a raise, or a job. Women have made sexual harassment claims in order to eliminate rivals or to strike first if they were about to be fired for poor performance. The former happened at Miller Brewing Company and was detailed in the July 1997 MANifesto. The latter happened at Oracle Corp. and was detailed in the same issue.

All sexual harassment accusations are political. Most of all, feminism's responses to such accusations are political. If the accusation is against a political foe, feminists Hector us with accusations that we "tolerate" abuse until the accused is punished. If the accusation is against a big corporation where feminists can picture lots of affirmative action and special "diversity" promotions, they hammer the company. If the accusation is against someone who kicks a lot of taxpayer money their way, they say: "Harassment? What harassment?"

Ambassador Hicks was terminated based on only two unproven accusations, while Clinton is still in office. It goes to show that what is good for the goose is not good for the gander.*

As for Clinton, he's always good for the occasional goose.²⁸³

If You Are the Father, are you a Parent?

Consider this question. You're a dad. Are you a parent?

The question might seem self evident. But when it comes to the law, it isn't necessarily so.

U.S. law defines parenthood entirely differently for women and men. If a child is born out of wedlock to an American woman, the child automatically has U.S. citizenship. If a child is born out of wedlock to an American man, the child does not have automatic citizenship. In fact, the child would have to go through several extra steps -- and complete them before a deadline -- in order to

have the same rights as a child who gets it automatically because of his or her mother.

This fact was highlighted recently by a Supreme Court case involving Lorelyn Penero Miller. She was born out of wedlock to a Filipino mother and an American serviceman. Had she been born out of wedlock to an American service*woman,* citizenship would have been automatic. The court, in a split opinion, turned down her bid. It let stand the law that discriminates against children based on the sex of their parent.

Feminists who say they are striving for "equality" in the military might want to look into this.

At the root, of course, is the prejudice that children belong with the mother and that the father is detachable and expendable.

Take a gander at what the Washington Post said about this case: "The larger question, of course, is the extent to which our society must be gender-blind even on those subjects -- such as parenthood -- in which men and women are very different."

All right, Washington Post. Try referring to areas "in which men and women are very different" in relationship to combat fitness, the ability and willingness to work, artistic and literary talent, and so on. Moral of the story: it's always permissible to say that men and women are different if women benefit from the claim. Anything else is "sexism."

The Post also goes on: "Does the recognition that motherhood and fatherhood are not identical necessarily flow from and reinforce stereotypes, or is it a nod to reality?"

Let's try this another way: "Does the recognition that boys' and girls' math scores have never been equal flow from stereotypes, or is it a nod to reality?"

Go ahead and print such a statement, Post. When the feminists are done with you, we'll lay flowers at the crater where your office once was.

Feminists launched their movement claiming that they believed in equality. But as it shakes out, "equality" means that feminists acquired access to traditional male roles while retaining all traditional female privileges such as child custody. Feminists get to enter traditionally male areas and still shut men out of traditionally female areas. If you think we're exaggerating, take a look down Florida way.

* "U.S. Envoy to Eritrea Quit After Sex Misconduct Probe," Associated Press report, *the Washington Post*, October 31, 1998, page A10

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Robert Young raised his two daughters while his wife worked as a senior partner in a Miami law firm. Young lead one daughter's Brownie troop and coached another's soccer team. He stayed at home and cared for them while his wife, Alice Hector, was out having it all.

Young had worked as an architect in Albuquerque, New Mexico. But when Hector got the job with a Miami law firm, he gave up his career and followed her there. Then she decided to leave him after 14 years.

She breaks up the home. And, in usual fashion, she's rewarded with the kids. The court gave her custody. Fathers and men in general are expendable.

Except that Young didn't see it that way. He had raised the kids. He had stayed home. He had given up his job.

So he filed an appeal, and won.

The court decided that, as the primary caregiver, the children would be better off with him.

We have been in several discussions with feminists who swear that they believe the primary caregiver ought to get the children. Problem is, one of their criteria for being named primary caregiver is the possession of ovaries. No matter what a man does, these feminists will always find some way to define the woman as the primary caregiver. This way, they're sticking by their "principles" -- it's just that their principles shift to suit the moment. One feminist once claimed that dropping the kids off at daycare qualifies a woman as the primary caregiver. Come again? Dumping your kids on someone else to raise makes you a primary caregiver?

But as for Mr. Young, he may have won his appeal, but his wife still has the kids. She asked for another hearing, and they are with her while it is pending.

This case made for some interesting bias in the Washington Post. It said: "The case has advocates of working mothers and supporters of fathers' rights questioning whether a working mother must choose between career and children if she wants to maintain primary custody or whether a father has the same nurturing ability as a mother."

Dear Post: We bet that this case did NOT have supporters of fathers' rights questioning whether a father has the same nurturing

ability as a mother. We hope this was just an unintentional slip due to poor word choice. But if this was a slip, it says something about the culture of the Post that no one caught it or fixed it. No one reflected on how fathers would feel about this.

As for the ex-wife, Hector, she's playing victim. Her husband's case "sets the cause of working women back a generation," says Hector. What generation would that be, Ms. Hector? Your mother's generation did not think it was entitled to work full time and still have the prerogatives of a full-time parent. That came along with feminists who insisted that women should "have it all."

It is typical of feminists that they think a woman should be able to take any traditionally "male" position away from a man while maintaining any traditionally "female" position for their own. For feminists, equality is a one-way street. Equality does not apply to men. Equality, at least in the working definition, means that feminists get whatever they want.

The kicker is that Hector was the one who filed for divorce. As we said earlier in this issue, there are many women who assume they can walk away from a marriage and it's automatic that they take the kids with them, no matter what.

Guess what a feminist lawyer had to say about this case.

First, just a recap. Man stays home with kids. Woman wants divorce. Woman assumes she gets custody. Court awards her custody right off the bat. Man has to go back to court to seek custody. While the case is pending, the children are with the mother, who still works full time.

Okay, so what does the feminist lawyer say? That this case is about bias against women!

We hope you didn't have a mouthful of coffee while reading that one.

But, says Nancy Chang, who filed a friend-of-the-court brief supporting Hector: "The court may have been too ready to assume that the father's contributions outweighed the mother's. It's a form of gender bias."

Oh sure, Ms. Chang. Courts have been known for assuming that the father's contributions outweigh the mother's.

On Mars, maybe.

1998

As one of Young's lawyers, Barbara Green, put it: "If a trial court had done to a stay-at-home wife what they did to Mr. Young, it would have been reversed in a second without any protest." We agree with that. What feminists are mad about is that a man just got equal rights.

Ms. Chang is with a New York group that bills itself as the Center for Constitutional Rights. Apparently feminists think that

women have a Constitutional right to have it all. Or that she has a Constitutional right to child custody.

We bet we could shock Ms. Chang to the soul with an amazing revelation -- something she probably never thought of: namely, that men have rights under the Constitution, too.²⁸⁴

There. We'll leave her alone for a bit to recover from that bombshell.²⁸⁵

NOTES

¹ “The Veggie-Penis Lawsuit,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#penis>>

² “Jesus Christ: Potential Rapist,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#jesus>>

³ “Chief Wins Harassment Suit,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#harassment>>

⁴ “Sexual Harassment at the Corp. For Public Broadcasting,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#broadcasting>>

⁵ “Feminist Pay Grab Defeated,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#grab>>

⁶ “Northern Exposure Actor Charged,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#actor>>

⁷ “Male and Presumed Guilty,” *MANifesto*, January 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090536/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january96.html#guilty>>

⁸ “It Takes a Pillage,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#pillage>>

⁹ “Killed by a False Rape Charge,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#killed>>

¹⁰ “Separate and Unequal Justice,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#unequal>>

¹¹ “Junior Discrimination,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#discrimination>>

¹² “The Governor of Illinois is Male,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#governor>>

¹³ “Women’s Studies: Your Money at Work,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#womens>>

¹⁴ “What Feminists Say,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#say>>

¹⁵ “The ‘Myth’ of Hysteria,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#hysteria>>

NOTES

¹⁶ “From Chauvinism to Patriarchy,” *MANifesto*, February 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085052/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february96.html#chauvinism>>

¹⁷ “It’s Always the Man’s Fault,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#always>>

¹⁸ “Justice, Blind and Deaf: The Moon Case,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#justice>>

¹⁹ “Killed by a False Rape Charge (Not, alas, a Reprint),” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#killed>>

²⁰ “This is Equity?” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#equity>>

²¹ “A Bloody Gender Feminist at The Washington Post,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#bloody>>

²² “‘60 Minutes’ Prison Rape Segment,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#prison>>

²³ “Hear Me Roar,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#roar>>

²⁴ “Let’s Do the Feminist Dance of Denial,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#dance>>

²⁵ “The ‘Moderate’ Feminists,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#moderate>>

²⁶ “North Koreans Hold All the Power,” *MANifesto*, March 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021225085511/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march96.html#koreans>>

²⁷ “Unclear on the Concept,” *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#unclear>>

²⁸ “Raked by Catt’s Claws,” *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#claws>>

²⁹ “Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries,” *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#ovaries>>

³⁰ “Stalkers, Sexual Predators, and Power Rangers,” *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#stalkers>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

³¹ "The Score is Men, 35 Million; Women, Zero," *MANifesto*, April 1996.

Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#score>>

³² "Mr. Democrat, The Sexist Senator," *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#senator>>

³³ "An Unusual Case," *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#unusual>>

³⁴ "Exceptional Feminists," *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#exceptional>>

³⁵ "The Responsibility Gap," *MANifesto*, April 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021117180741/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april96.html#responsibility>>

³⁶ "Another One Bites the Dust," *MANifesto*, May 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#dust>>

³⁷ "License to Stereotype," *MANifesto*, May 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#license>>

³⁸ "We Meant 'Man'-Datory Punishment!" *Manifesto*, May 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#man>>

³⁹ "Glad She Cleared that Up," *MANifesto*, May 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#glad>>

⁴⁰ "A Feminist Hammer," *MANifesto*, May 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#hammer>>

⁴¹ "All Women Are Potential Munchausen Cases?" *MANifesto*, May 1996.

Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021230201844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may96.html#women>>

⁴² *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html>>

⁴³ "Why Would She Lie? (Oops, She Did!)," *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#why>>

⁴⁴ "The Caller from Libelville: You're on the Air," *MANifesto*, June 1996.

Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#caller>>

⁴⁵ "Believe the Children," *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#believe>>

⁴⁶ "Who is the Abuser?" *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#abuser>>

NOTES

⁴⁷ “A Call to Protect Women,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#protect>>

⁴⁸ “The Next Susan Smith,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#smith>>

⁴⁹ “First Amendment? In a Pig’s Eye!” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#first>>

⁵⁰ “Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#ovaries>>

⁵¹ “Just in Time for Father’s Day: Dad Bashing,” *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#bashing>>

⁵² “Senator Biden’s Level Playing Field,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#biden>>

⁵³ “Plane Crash Hits Women Hardest,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#POW>>

⁵⁴ “Play Exciting New Game: Moral High Ground,” *MANifesto*, June 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093309/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june96.html#game>>

⁵⁵ “More Mugu To-Do,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#mugu>>

⁵⁶ “Protecting the Womenfolk, Part I,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#womenfolk1>>

⁵⁷ “Protecting the Womenfolk, Part II,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#womenfolk2>>

⁵⁸ “Protecting the Womenfolk, Part III,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#womenfolk3>>

⁵⁹ “Protecting the Womenfolk, Part IV,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#womenfolk4>>

⁶⁰ “Protecting the Womenfolk, Part V: My Own Rush to Judgment,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#womenfolk5>>

⁶¹ “Men are Ringleaders, Women are Drugged,” *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#leaders>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

⁶² "Remembrance of Things False," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#false>>

⁶³ "Fried Green History," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#tomatoes>>

⁶⁴ "Truth, Schmuth," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#truth>>

⁶⁵ "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#cosmo>>

⁶⁶ "POW President Harasses Herself," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#pow>>

⁶⁷ "POW Reacts to Hillary Committing an Axe Murder," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#hillary>>

⁶⁸ "Feminist Lifeguards," *MANifesto*, July 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090553/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july96.html#lifeguards>>

⁶⁹ "Men Make Good Targets," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#targets>>

⁷⁰ "Men are Good for Money," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#money>>

⁷¹ "Dead Men are Good for Alimony," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#alimony>>

⁷² "Men are Good for Kicks," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#kicks>>

⁷³ "Little Boys are Bloody Good," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#bloody>>

⁷⁴ "Men are Good for Following Orders," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#orders>>

⁷⁵ "Men can be Taken for Granted," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#granted>>

⁷⁶ "Men Take Away Sin," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#sin>>

NOTES

⁷⁷ "One Heck of a Diversity Leader," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#leader>>

⁷⁸ "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#cosmo>>

⁷⁹ "POW demands Affirmative Action in Combat," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#pow1>>

⁸⁰ Source: The soc.feminism newsgroup, Sexism and mass marketing. Get *conscious*! Re: McDonalds Happy Meals Sexist?!

⁸¹ "POW gets to the Bottom of the Diaper Conspiracy," *MANifesto*, August 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/august96.html#pow2>>

⁸² "Dedication: Carol Moseley-Braun," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#carol>>

⁸³ "A Feminist Defends Free Speech ... Well, Sort Of," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#speech>>

⁸⁴ "Women Clean Up Politics ... (Well, at Least they Clean Up)," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#clean>>

⁸⁵ "So Nicely they Settle Their Disputes," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#nicely>>

⁸⁶ "Women are More Artistic and Sensitive," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#artistic>>

⁸⁷ "A Feminist Condemns Male-Bashing ... Well, Sort Of," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#bashing>>

⁸⁸ "Mothers Give You the Business," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#mothers>>

⁸⁹ "Nutrition Leader Feeds us a Line," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#nutrition>>

⁹⁰ "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#cosmo>>

⁹¹ "The Honest Feminist Contest," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#honest>>

⁹² Got any of your own? E-mail them with the subject line "You Might Be A Male Feminist If ..." to PerAddress@gnn.com. If we get more, we'll run them in future issues.

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

⁹³ "You Might be a Male Feminist If ..." *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#feminist>>

⁹⁴ "POW says Dead men are Healthier," *MANifesto*, September 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122044521/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september96.html#pow>>

⁹⁵ "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part I," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#guilty1>>

⁹⁶ "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part II," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#guilty2>>

⁹⁷ "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part III," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#guilty3>>

⁹⁸ "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part IV," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#guilty4>>

⁹⁹ "Male and Presumed Guilty, Part V," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#guilty5>>

¹⁰⁰ "The Justice and Johnathan," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#johnathan>>

¹⁰¹ "Where are These Strong Women?" *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#strong>>

¹⁰² "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#cosmo>>

¹⁰³ "The Honest Feminist Contest – Continued," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#honest>>

¹⁰⁴ "You Might be a Male Feminist If ..." *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#feminist>>

¹⁰⁵ "Affirmative Action for Chess," *MANifesto*, October 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043136/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october96.html#chess>>

¹⁰⁶ "Women Make Better Bosses," *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#bosses>>

¹⁰⁷ "Shake Your Bhutto," *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#bhutto>>

NOTES

¹⁰⁸ “Not in the Headlines,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#headlines>>

¹⁰⁹ “Girls Will Be Girls,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#girls>>

¹¹⁰ “Hidden Abuse, Part I,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#hidden1>>

¹¹¹ “Hidden Abuse, Part II,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#hidden2>>

¹¹² “Adjust the Facts, Ma’am,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#just>>

¹¹³ “No Story Here,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#story>>

¹¹⁴ “Another ‘Choice’ in the Trash Can,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#choice>>

¹¹⁵ “Feminist Logic,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#logic>>

¹¹⁶ “Cosmowatch,” *Manifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#cosmo>>

¹¹⁷ “Certs: A Patriarchal Conspiracy,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html#certs>>

¹¹⁸ “POW says Girls Shortchanged on Height,” *MANifesto*, November 1996. Available at:

<<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122035813/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november96.html>>

¹¹⁹ “Snuffing Out Credibility,” *MANifesto*, January 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#snuff>>

¹²⁰ “Night Lyin’,” *MANifesto*, January 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#lyin>>

¹²¹ “Ending the Good-Old-Boys Club,” *Manifesto*, January 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#club>>

¹²² “Another Story You Might Have Missed,” *MANifesto*, January 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#story>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

¹²³ "False Accusations are Bad Because ..." *MANifesto*, Janaury 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#false>>

¹²⁴ "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, January 1007. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210090403/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january97.html#cosmo>>

¹²⁵ "Seeing Through the Glass Ceiling," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#seeing>>

¹²⁶ "The Wages of Men," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#wages>>

¹²⁷ "More Choices Without Voices," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#choices>>

¹²⁸ "Flying High with the First Wives Club," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#wives>>

¹²⁹ "Cosmowatch," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#cosmo>>

¹³⁰ Visit the Home Page at: <<http://shell.idt.net/~per2/index.htm>>

¹³¹ See the site at: <<http://www.iwf.org/>>

¹³² See at: <<http://falcon.nji.com/~vera/>>

¹³³ "Per's Picks," *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#picks>>

¹³⁴ *MANifesto*, February 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210085937/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/february97.html#wages>>

¹³⁵ "Not Tonight, Dear, I have an Urban Legend," *MANifesto*, March 1997, Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#headache>>

¹³⁶ "Stupid Lawyer Trick," *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#trick>>

¹³⁷ "Kill a Kid, Hit the Lecture Circuit," *MANifesto*, march 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#kill>>

¹³⁸ "When is a Child Who is Not Your Child Your Child?" *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#child>>

¹³⁹ "Taking Care of a Man," *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#care>>

NOTES

¹⁴⁰ “Reach Out an Stalk Someone,” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#reach>>

¹⁴¹ “Children Need Abusers?” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#children>>

¹⁴² “Justice has Very Poor Ames,” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#justice>>

¹⁴³ “Court Orders Domestic Violence,” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#court>>

¹⁴⁴ “Can I Have My Blood Money Back, Please,” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#blood>>

¹⁴⁵ “POW Condemns Good Friday,” *MANifesto*, March 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021119150334/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march97.html#pow>>

¹⁴⁶ “Predators and Prey,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#predators>>

¹⁴⁷ “Punishing a Responsible Man,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#punishing>>

¹⁴⁸ “Their Choice, our Responsibility,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#choice>>

¹⁴⁹ “Destroying Democracy?” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#destroying>>

¹⁵⁰ “Feedback on Harassment Comments,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#feedback>>

¹⁵¹ “More Stupid Law Tricks,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#tricks>>

¹⁵² “Ethics Watchdogs,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#ethics>>

¹⁵³ “POW Demands Parity with Hostages in Peru,” *MANifesto*, April 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210100155/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april97.html#pow>>

¹⁵⁴ “Flinn Flam,” *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#flinn>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

¹⁵⁵ "Being Nice to the Bigots," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#bigots>>

¹⁵⁶ "An Honest Feminist," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#honest>>

¹⁵⁷ "You Might be a Male Feminist If..." *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#feminist>>

¹⁵⁸ "Susan McDougal's Delicate Ears," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#mcdougal>>

¹⁵⁹ "This Will Need More Research," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#research>>

¹⁶⁰ "Free Press? Sure, Help Yourself," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#free>>

¹⁶¹ "The Former American Civil Liberties Union," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#former>>

¹⁶² "The Senator's Level Playing Field," *MANifesto*, May 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122040844/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may97.html#senator>>

¹⁶³ "Amazon, Schmamazon," *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#amazon>>

¹⁶⁴ "Breast Implants – Who's Responsible?" *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#breast>>

¹⁶⁵ "Deliver us from Clitoris," *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#deliver>>

¹⁶⁶ "The Right to Bash Men," *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#bash>>

¹⁶⁷ "Be Prepared ... for Feminist 'Equality'," *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#equality>>

¹⁶⁸ "Battered Woman's Defense: License to Kill," *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#kill>>

¹⁶⁹ "Children belong with their Mother?" *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#children>>

NOTES

¹⁷⁰ “The Former ACLU, Part Deux,” *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#aclu>>

¹⁷¹ See: <<http://www.emrkt.com/books/dbmd.html>>

¹⁷² His books are available to order online, or by calling (800) 987-7771. And you can e-mail him at: <DeanTong@aol.com>

¹⁷³ “Dirty Tricks,” *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#tricks>>

¹⁷⁴ “Speaking of Dirty Tricks,” *MANifesto*, June 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092200/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june97.html#tricks2>>

¹⁷⁵ “Did False Accusations Kill Michael Dorris?” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#false>>

¹⁷⁶ “Dad-Bashing in ‘Non Sequitor’ Comic Strip,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#bashing>>

¹⁷⁷ “Justice in the ‘Seinfeld’ Case,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#seinfeld>>

¹⁷⁸ “One-Year Sentence for False Accusation,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#sentence>>

¹⁷⁹ “The George Franklin Case,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#franklin>>

¹⁸⁰ “What to do About False Accusations?” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#todo>>

¹⁸¹ “Lady Thugs,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#thugs>>

¹⁸² See: <<jeancoyle@earthlink.net>

¹⁸³ “The Bigotry of Moderate Feminists,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#bigotry>>

¹⁸⁴ “Here’s to a Couple of Guys,” *MANifesto*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092745/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july97.html#guys>>

¹⁸⁵ “An Accusations Equals a Conviction,” *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#accusation>>

¹⁸⁶ “The Politics of False Accusations,” *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#false>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

¹⁸⁷ "Buddy, Can you Spare a Job?" *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#buddy>>

¹⁸⁸ "Porn Temple Pilots," *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#porn>>

¹⁸⁹ "G.I. Jane Needs to Train," *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#jane>>

¹⁹⁰ "Taking a Crack at Cashing In," *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#cashing>>

¹⁹¹ "Fired for a 'Lack of Sensitivity'," *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#fired>>

¹⁹² "Mickey Mouse Lawsuit," *MANifesto*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111036/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september97.html#mickey>>

¹⁹³ "Marv Albert: What You Don't Know," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#albert>>

¹⁹⁴ "The Man Haters Room," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#haters>>

¹⁹⁵ "Men are Such Liars," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#liars>>

¹⁹⁶ "The Blacklisting Continues," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#blacklisting>>

¹⁹⁷ "Missing Figures," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#missing>>

¹⁹⁸ "Clinton to Fathers: Drop Dead," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#clinton>>

¹⁹⁹ "Pants Suit," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#pants>>

²⁰⁰ "How to Deal with Feminists," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#feminists>>

²⁰¹ (Special thanks to the folks on soc.men.)

²⁰² "Gravity Holds Women Down," *MANifesto*, October 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043009/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october97.html#pow>>

NOTES

²⁰³ “Not Guilty by Reason of Ovaries,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#ovaries>>

²⁰⁴ “The Right to Sniff Glue,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#sniff>>

²⁰⁵ “Wrist Slap for a Rapist,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#wrist>>

²⁰⁶ “Meanwhile, Back at Responsibility...” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#responsibility>>

²⁰⁷ “Flinn Flam, Part II,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#flinn>>

²⁰⁸ “The New York Times Plays Catch-up,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#catchup>>

²⁰⁹ “Equality in the Gutter,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#equality>>

²¹⁰ “More Choices Without Voices,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#choices>>

²¹¹ “More Moral Lessons,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#lessons>>

²¹² See: <<http://idt.net/~per2/powpage.htm>>

²¹³ “POW Demands Septuplet Equality,” *MANifesto*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122043024/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/november97.html#pow>>

²¹⁴ “Fitness Standards, Double Standards,” *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#double>>

²¹⁵ “Scaring Women to Death,” *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#scaring>>

²¹⁶ “Chauvinist Pigs, Guinea Pigs,” *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#pigs>>

²¹⁷ “Happy Tubby Me?” *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#tubby>>

²¹⁸ “Her Body, Her Selfishness,” *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#self>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

²¹⁹ "More Battered Logic Defense," *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#battered>>

²²⁰ "Feminists are Not Your Allies," *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#allies>>

²²¹ "Trucker Fired for Saving Lives," *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#fired>>

²²² "Gloria Allred Jokes," *MANifesto*, January 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210105713/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/january98.html#jokes>>

²²³ "Sexual politics as Usual," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#politics>>

²²⁴ "Per's Rule of Feminist Support," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#support>>

²²⁵ "Are Men More Responsible than Women?" *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#responsible>>

²²⁶ "Understanding the McKinney Verdict," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#mckinney>>

²²⁷ "Depths of Absurdity," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#absurdity>>

²²⁸ "Depths of Dishonesty," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#dishonesty>>

²²⁹ "More Choices Without Voices," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#choices>>

²³⁰ "Stepdaughter Accuses Ortega of Abusing Her," *The Washington Post*, March 14, 1998, pg. A17. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-03/14/0881-031498-idx.html>>

²³¹ "Humor: Checks and Balances," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#checks>>

²³² "Willey and the Hand Jive," *MANifesto*, March 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021207021235/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/march98.html#willey>>

²³³ "It's Men's Lifestyle that Kills'Em," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#lifestyle>>

NOTES

²³⁴ "Clinton to Veterans: Drop Dead," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#clinton>>

²³⁵ "Titanic Myths," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#titanic>>

²³⁶ "The Cheapness of Male Life," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#%22cheapness%22>>

²³⁷ "Wil Hetherington and Fred Dever," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#wil>>

²³⁸ "Addendum," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#addendum>>

²³⁹ "A Letter to Manifesto," *MANifesto*, April 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210095352/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/april98.html#letter>>

²⁴⁰ "Viragos Versus Viagra," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#viragos>>

²⁴¹ "Make Something Up," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#make>>

²⁴² "Bravo, Mark," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#mark>>

²⁴³ "Phil Hartman Will Not be Remembered," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#phil>>

²⁴⁴ "Equality: All Washed Up," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#equality>>

²⁴⁵ "Touch Touche," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#touch>>

²⁴⁶ "Sieg Her!" *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/2002122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#sieg>>

²⁴⁷ Blaine Harden, "Ferraro Lashes Out On Mastectomy Bill: Outraged D'Amato Demands Apology, And Breast Cancer Groups Defend Him," *The Washington Post*, Tuesday, May 19, 1998. Page A06 Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-05/19/0311-051998-idx.html>>

²⁴⁸ See: <<http://www.cancer.org/frames.html>>

²⁴⁹ Note: For more information on prostate cancer, visit the American Cancer Society's site at: <<http://www.cancer.org/frames.html>> then click on "Cancer

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

Information" and then "Specific Cancers." Scroll down to the prostate section. Be sure to check out the Man to Man Prostate Cancer Information section.

²⁵⁰ "You're So Inane," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#inane>>

²⁵¹ "Quotable," *MANifesto*, May 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122041114/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/may98.html#quotable>>

²⁵² "Justice for Me and Not for Thee," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#thee>>

²⁵³ "Justice for Lassies, Nae for Laddies," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#lassies>>

²⁵⁴ "Some Good Nudes and Some Bad Nudes," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#nudes>>

²⁵⁵ "Life or Choice?" *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#choice>>

²⁵⁶ "Nanny News," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#nanny>>

²⁵⁷ "Fred Dever Defense Fund," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#dever>>

²⁵⁸ "Mother wins landmark case," *BBC News*. Thursday, May 21, 1998. Published at 13:00 GMT 14:00 UK

²⁵⁹ "Justice Down the Tube," *MANifesto*, June 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210092433/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/june98.html#tube>>

²⁶⁰ "Suffer the Little Children," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#suffer>>

²⁶¹ "A Limitless Choice to Hurt," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#choice>>

²⁶² "Surprise, Surprise: You Have Rights," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#surprise>>

²⁶³ "Crackdown on Crack Moms," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#crack>>

²⁶⁴ "Rape: Funny No More," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#rape>>

NOTES

²⁶⁵ "Modern-Day Slavers," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#slavers>>

²⁶⁶ "Selective Equality," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#selective>>

²⁶⁷ "Woman accused of endangering two sons," *Associated Press*.

²⁶⁸ "Munchausen Mumbo Jumbo," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#munchausen>>

²⁶⁹ "Humor: Your Real Motive," *MANifesto*, July 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021210093215/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/july98.html#humor>>

²⁷⁰ "The Only True Sin," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#sin>>

²⁷¹ "The Failed Morality of the Liberals," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#morality>>

²⁷² "Crackdown on Crack Moms, Part II," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#crack>>

²⁷³ "A Letter to Manifesto," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#letter>>

²⁷⁴ Daniel Waddell, "Abuse alert over school sun cream," *Electronic Telegraph*, 14 August 1998. Available at: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk:80/et?ac=00050233-1060165&rtmo=QpOewS0R&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/98/8/14/nabu14.html>>; John Carvel, "Male teachers fear slurs: Primary school careers 'tainted,'" *The Guardian*, Saturday August 29, 1998. Available at: <<http://reports.guardian.co.uk/articles/1998/8/29/18956.html>>; "Police arrest nine Chinese and Korean women for crime spree," *the Associated Press*, May 30, 1998.)

²⁷⁵ "Feminism Causes Cancer?" *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#cancer>>

²⁷⁶ See: <<http://www.menstuff.org/cgi/daily.cgi>>

²⁷⁷ See: <www.menstuff.org> <menstuff@menstuff.org>

²⁷⁸ "Men's Health," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#health>>

²⁷⁹ "When Bill Clinton Farts in an Elevator," *MANifesto*, September 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021127111942/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/september98.html#clinton>>

²⁸⁰ "Like a Fish Needs a Bicycle," *MANifesto*, October 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122042001/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october98.html#fish>>

PER'S MANIFESTO 1996-1998

²⁸¹ "Fat Chance," *MANifesto*, October 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122042001/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october98.html#fat>>

²⁸² "Bully for Them," *MANifesto*, October 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122042001/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october98.html#bully>>

²⁸³ "Good for the Goose," *MANifesto*, October 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122042001/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october98.html#goose>>

²⁸⁴ "Mothers, Fathers, and Citizens," *The Washington Post*, Monday, April 27, 1998. Page A16; Rachel La Corte, "In Miami, New Issues Of Custody Case Tests Gender, Caregiver Roles," *Associated Press*, Tuesday, August 18, 1998; Page A08. Available at: <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1998-08/18-/053l-081898-idx.html>>

²⁸⁵ "If You Are the Father, are you a Parent?" *MANifesto*, October 1998. Available at: <<http://web.archive.org/web/20021122042001/http://members.telocity.com/~snyderboy/per/manifesto/october98.html#father>>